CHURCH ORGANIZATION AS AN AGENCY OF SOCIAL CONTROL: CHURCH DISCIPLINE IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1800-1860

by

Cortland Victor Smith

A dissertation submitted to the faculty
of the University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Department
of History

Chapel Hill

1966

Approved by:

Elisha P. Douglass
Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE. iii

CHAPTER

I. THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS 1

The Discipline of Friends
The Disciplinary Experience

II. THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH 73

The Discipline
The Disciplinary Experience

III. THE BAPTISTS 131

Standards of Conduct
The Disciplinary Experience

IV. CONCLUSIONS. 206

BIBLIOGRAPHY 210

APPENDIX I 223

APPENDIX II. 251

APPENDIX III 276

APPENDIX IV. 304

APPENDIX V 342

PREFACE

Students of the history of the Christian Church in the United States have frequently commented on the marked decrease in the efforts of churches to control the personal lives of their members. It is generally acknowledged that excommunication has, in the present century, become a rare experience, especially within the larger denominations, whereas it was a major activity in earlier decades. The purpose of this study is to examine the disciplinary experience of three denominational groups in North Carolina during the period 1800-1860. Explorations will be made in two particular areas: the standards of moral conduct demanded by churches of their members during the period under study, and the number of people who were disciplined by their church because of their failure to observe the expected standards. Throughout the study an effort will be made to discern trends in church discipline in terms of both standards and frequency.

The denominational groups to be studied are the Society of Friends, commonly known as the Quakers, the Methodists and the Baptists. These groups were chosen for study because of the relatively large amount of documentary materials available, the wide geographical distribution of the churches and because together they provide a wide cross-section of the population of the state.

The initial date of the study was determined largely by the availability of reasonably adequate documentary material. The Civil War produced such traumatic alteration in the lives of the people of the State that it seemed to be a logical terminal date. In addition, a period of sixty years is sufficiently long to permit the observation of definite developmental trends and changes in emphasis in church discipline.

Credit is due to many whose advice and encouragement have made this study possible. My advisor, Dr. Elisha P. Douglass, suggested the investigation of records which eventually led to the selection of this particular area of study. His continual interest and wise counsel have been invaluable throughout the progress of the project. The Staffs of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Manuscript Division of the Duke University Library, the Quaker Room at Guilford College, the Microfilm Division of Wake Forest College Library, and the Division of Archives and Manuscripts of the North Carolina Commission of Archives and History have been most gracious not only in searching out and making available the necessary source material but in adding a personal interest that has made the research a pleasant task. Dr. Frederick B. Tolles and Dorothy G. Harris of the Friends' Historical Library of Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, have contributed their efforts and encouragement. But, most especially, credit is due to my wife who has not only kept the home fires burning but has also contributed much directly to the enterprise. Without her encouragement and her readiness to postpone long dreamed hopes and plans for still another year this study would not have been possible. To her, this work is most affectionately dedicated.

CHAPTER I

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

Accepted Standards of Conduct

The history of the Society of Friends in North Carolina is almost as long as that of the State itself. William Edmundson, a Quaker missionary, tells of visiting Henry Phillips, a settler, who lived in the area of present-day Hertford in 1671. He called a meeting, and seems to have gained some converts. Monthly and quarterly meetings were probably established by 1680. George Fox, founder of the Quaker movement, who had visited the province in 1672 and again in 1686, advised the establishment of a semi-yearly or yearly meeting.[1] The Charter of the Carolina Province, issued by Charles II in 1663, gave the Lords Proprietors full authority to grant religious freedom to persons who for reasons of conscience could not "submit to the publick exercise of religion according to the liturgy, forms and ceremonies of the

---

[1] Allen C. Thomas, _A History of the Friends in America_. (Pennsbury Series of Modern Quaker Books, Vol. IV). (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., 1930), pp. 86, 87.

Church of England."[2] This grant of religious liberty encouraged Quaker migration to the province, so that by 1700 a quarterly meeting and three monthly meetings had been established in North Carolina. In 1702, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends received a request for assistance in the preparation of a Discipline, and the records of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting began in 1708.[3]

Stephen B. Weeks points out that the early years of the eighteenth century saw little geographical expansion of the Quaker movement in North Carolina. Friends were concentrated largely in the coastal area. Membership increase was due partly to natural growth, partly to evangelism but only in slight degree to immigration.[4] By mid-century, however, the situation was drastically changed. Migration from Pennsylvania had filled much of the south-central part of Virginia, especially Fairfax, Frederick and Loudoun counties. Before the Virginia meetings had become strong, however, the tide of immigration had begun to flow past the latter counties and into North Carolina. The strong Quaker settlement of Alamance, Chatham, Guilford, Randolph and Surrey counties was built up almost entirely by this population flow from the old Friends' stronghold in Pennsylvania.

---

[2] William L. Saunders (ed.), The Colonial Records of North Carolina (Raleigh: North Carolina Commission of History and Archives, 10 vols.), I, 32, 33.

[3] Stephen Beauregard Weeks, Southern Quakers and Slavery: A Study in Institutional History. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Studies, extra volume 15, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1896) pp. 47, 50, 51. (Hereafter cited as Weeks, Southern Quakers).

[4] Ibid., pp. 70, 77.

The story of the immigration can be told partly in the record of the establishment of monthly meetings; 1733, Core Sound, in Carteret and Hyde counties; 1746, Carver's Creek in Bladen County and Dunn's Creek in Cumberland County; 1748, Contentnea in Wayne County; 1751, Cane Creek in Alamance and Chatham counties; 1754, New Garden in Guilford County; 1760, Rich Square in Northampton and Hertford counties; 1764, Perquimans County; 1772, Center in Guilford and Randolph; 1778, Deep River in Guilford; 1787, Westfield in Surry; 1790, Holly Springs in Randolph; 1791, Springfield in Randolph and Davidson counties; 1792, Trent serving members in Jones and Craven counties; 1793, Spring in Alamance and Chatham, Deep Creek in Yadkin and Back Creek in Randolph; 1794, Piney Woods and Sutton's Creek in Perquimans County. Although a number of these meetings had not been formally organized by the outbreak of the American Revolution, the flood of migration into the state was largely complete by that time.[5] By the end of the eighteenth century,

---

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 97-109, also Appendix II, pp. 325-330.

Quakerism was strongly established in three main areas: in scattered locations on the Atlantic coast and in the Tidelands, in the Piedmont section centering around present-day Greensboro, and in the lower mountains of Surry and Yadkin counties. Altogether the Quakers had established nineteen monthly meetings and at least fifty-five places of worship.[6]

The experience of the Society of Friends is an especially fruitful one for studying church discipline and the utilization of religious organization as an agency for social control and the maintainence of moral standards of personal conduct. In the first place, the Quakers early developed detailed standards of church discipline. These circulated first in manuscript form but were published as early as 1809 in North Carolina. A manuscript "Book of Rules" was adopted by the London Yearly Meeting in 1738, and a printed Discipline, adopted in 1782, was published in 1783.[7] Philadelphia Friends depended upon manuscript disciplines until 1797.[8] A second edition of the Philadelphia Discipline was published in 1806,[9] which bears a marked resemblance to the Discipline of Friends adopted in North Carolina three years later.[10] In the second place, monthly meetings kept detailed

---

[6] Ibid., Appendix II, pp. 325-342.

[7] Thomas, History of the Friends in America, p. 105.

[8] Letter, Dorothy H. Harris, Associate Director, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Penna., to author, June 2, 1965.

---

[9] Society of Friends, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends Held in Philadelphia. Printed by Order of the Meeting. (Philadelphia: Kimber, Conrad & Co., 1806). (Herafter cited as Philadelphia Discipline, 1806).

[10] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved of by the Yearly Meeting, Held in New Garden, in Guilford County, North-Carolina, from the 30th of the 10th to the 3rd of the 11th Month, Inclusive (Raleigh /N. C./: Thomas Henderson, 1809). (Hereafter cited as Discipline, NCYM, 1809).

Although the title page of Discipline NCYM 1809 indicates it to be a revision, careful search has been unable to produce evidence of any earlier edition. Dr. Frederick B. Towles, in a letter to the author, indicated that a search of the resources of the Harvard University Library failed to reveal any trace of such a publication prior to 1809. Search in the standard bibliographies has been equally fruitless. It is possible that the revision of 1809 was based upon manuscript disciplines such as were used in London prior to 1782 and by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting before 1797. If this be true, no such manuscript is known to be in existence, although search has been made in the historical collections of Guilford College, Guilford, N.C., a Quaker-connected institution. For the text of Discipline, NCYM 1809, together with subsequent changes, see Appendix I hereto.

Because of the close chronological and ideological connection between the Philadelphia and North Carolina Disciplines, a brief comparison of them may be appropriate. The most obvious difference is that of physical bulk; the Philadelphia Discipline contains 126 pages, while that of North Carolina has but 27. Although this is partly compensated for by the use of smaller type, a quick estimate would indicate that the Philadelphia production is approximately three times as large. Part of the difference comes from the fact that Discipline, NCYM 1809 does not include the extensive Biblical quotations which are to be found in the Philadelphia volume. Further, a large number of sections of the latter volume records of births, marriages, deaths, certificates of dismissal issued for members who were moving to new communities and disownment of members for failure to live up to the demanded standards of conduct.

As the Discipline of Friends is the basis for the entire administrative and disciplinary system of the Quakers, an analysis of the book is in order. As each monthly meeting was essentially independent in government, the Discipline is largely advisory in nature; very seldom is it directive. Further, as each yearly meeting was also independent of all the others, there was no ecclesiastical body which had authority over all the others. Other yearly meetings usually followed the lead of the London Yearly Meeting, but this was not obligatory, and each yearly meeting could adopt a discipline which met its own individual needs. As an example, Philadelphia adopted a Discipline which was more detailed in regard to trade than did North Carolina,[11] but the latter was more explicit in regard to slavery.[12] The ensuing analysis of the Discipline of Friends adopted by the North Carolina

---

are omitted, while many paragraphs have been eliminated from sections which are parallel. All, in all, the North Carolina Discipline is much more direct and incisive.

[11] Philadelphia Discipline, 1806, pp. 107-111, and Discipline, NCYM 1809, p. 28.

[12] Discipline NCYM 1809, pp. 23, 23 and Philadelphia Discipline, 1806, pp. 73-76.

Yearly Meeting in 1809, and the changes that were made in the revisions of 1822,[13] 1836,[14] and 1854,[15] will be primarily concerned with those sections dealing with the standards of conduct expected of members of the Society of Friends. Administrative details will be noted only as they pertain directly to the content or enforcement of church discipline.

The Discipline of Friends is divided into sections which are arranged alphabetically; in the following study, an attempt will be made to present the material in a more logical order, beginning with the provisions for meetings for discipline and those for other purposes, the selection of religious leaders and their functions, the issuance of certificates to members who were removing from the community, the settlement of quarrels and disputes, rules regarding marriage, slavery and other aspects of Quaker moral and ethical standards.

---

[13] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved of by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North-Carolina, from the 4th to the 7th of the 11th Month, Inclusive, 1822 (Hillsborough, /N.C./: Dennis Heartt, 1822). (Hereafter cited as Discipline, NCYM, 1822).

[14] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved of by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North Carolina, from the 7th to the 11th of the 11th Month, Inclusive, 1836 (Jamestown, /N.C./, 1837). (Hereafter cited as Discipline, NCYM, 1836).

[15] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North Carolina, in the Eleventh Month, 1854 (Greensboro', N.C., 1855). (Hereafter cited as Discipline, NCYM, 1854).

Members of the Society of Friends were organized as "meetings," which were in the ascending order of preparative, monthly, quarterly and yearly meetings. Each meeting was accountable to the meeting above it, and sent representatives to its sessions. Copies of minutes and other official records were made available to any other meeting upon request.[16] Allen C. Thomas points out that the monthly meeting was the executive power for the membership of the Society and had the authority to receive and disown members and its actions were seldom criticized by higher meetings.[17] Rufus M. Jones is more specific as to the function of the monthly and yearly meetings. In addition to the powers mentioned by Thomas, he includes the issuance of certificates of membership, the erection of meeting houses, care of all property belonging to the meeting, the maintainance of records and the nomination of persons believed to be suitable to official position in the Society. The monthly meeting was usually composed of two or more congregations, each of which was organized as a preparative meeting. The yearly meeting was the highest legislative authority within the Society, and was constituted of all members living within a defined geographical area. The London Yearly Meeting was considered as the parent body, but it had no authority over other yearly gatherings.[18] Members who had violated the provisions of the Discipline and who wished to confess their faults were to make a written account of them; if their statements were found satisfactory by the committee which had investigated the case in the first place, they were presented to the monthly meeting, but only at a session for discipline, not one for worship.[19] Female members maintained their own meetings in the same ascending order mentioned above. Disciplinary authority over female members was vested in the women's meetings.[20]

---

[16] Discipline, NCYM, 1808, pp. 12, 13.

[17] Thomas, History of the Friends in America, p. 18.

The moral health of the Society was checked at quarterly intervals in each preparative and monthly meeting by a series of "queries" which were to be read, carefully considered and answered in writing. The written replies were consolidated at each level and finally presented to the yearly meeting. Taken together, the queries involved a survey of the conduct of the membership of the Society, including attendance and conduct at meetings for worship, avoidance of gossip, adherence to plainness and moderation in speech and dress, and the religious training of children. Attention was also given to the use of alcohol, any connection with slavery or gambling, attendance at taverns or other places of diversion, financial responsibility in business affairs, avoidance of prohibited trade, the relief of the poor and the orphans of the Society, and the avoidance of unnecessary suits at law against other Friends. After the queries had been considered and the answers prepared, members were to be deliberately advised to maintain current wills, to be sure that gifts and legacies were used for the purpose intended by the donor, to insure that Friends about to remove to another community take with them certificates attesting to their membership in the Society, and counsel quickly with any member who seemed likely to marry contrary to the provisions of the Discipline.[21] In 1822 the frequency of reading the queries was reduced.[22] In 1836 a query regarding the maintainance of the Friends' testimony against war was added.[23] Some minor adjustments were made in phrasing and arrangement of the queries in 1854, and an additional item regarding the avoidance of a hireling ministry was added.[24]

---

[18] Rufus M. Jones, The Later Periods of Quakerism, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1921), I, 110, 111.

[19] Discipline, NCYM, 1808, p. 28.

[20] Ibid., p. 29.

---

[21] Discipline, NCYM, 1808, p. 24-26.

[22] Discipline, NCYM 1822, pp. 24-26.

[23] Discipline, NCYM 1836, pp. 47-50.

An extensive section of the Discipline was entitled "Ministers and Elders and Their Meetings." As Francis C. Anscomb has pointed out, Friends adopted the custom of 'recording' those who spoke acceptably in meeting as "having received a gift in the ministry'." Such selection conferred no authority within the society but did include an invitation to sit in the honored place reserved for ministers.[25] Rufus M. Jones reminds us that ministers might be either men or women and were members who had demonstrated prophetic insight, persuasiveness in public speech and sobriety of character.[26] Another office was that of the elder, who did not share in the public ministry but whose function it was to look after the spiritual welfare of the membership of the meeting to which he belonged and to advise the ministers.[27]

In the North Carolina Discipline, it was provided that the names of prospective elders should be submitted to the monthly meeting and if the nominees were found worthy, their names were to be reported to the quarterly meeting. Members who had frequently spoken effectively in religious gatherings were to be considered first by the preparative meeting as prospective ministers, and a favorable report forwarded through the monthly to the quarterly meeting. No member was to act as a minister by traveling to other congregations or by calling any religious gathering without the approval of the monthly meeting. No minister was to travel beyond the limits of the Yearly Meeting without a certificate from the monthly meeting to which he belonged, or to Europe or the West Indies without the consent of the Yearly Meeting. Traveling ministers were to be received graciously, and criticism of any minister's message was to be given to him personally and in private.[28]

---

[24] Discipline, NCYM 1854, pp. 32-34.

[25] Francis C. Anscombe, I Have Called You Friends; The Story of Quakerism in North Carolina (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1959), p. 45. (Hereafter cited as Anscombe, I Have Called You Friends).

[26] Jones, Later Periods of Quakerism, II, 121.

[27] Ibid., II, 122.

The ministers and elders of each monthly meeting were to assemble once each three months in the capacity of a "preparative meeting," at which they were to answer a set of "queries" especially pertinent to their offices in the Society. These queries concerned punctuality in meeting appointments, soundness in preaching, purity in personal and family life, avoidance of business cares that might interfere with their ministry, mutual unity and fellowship with other ministers, maintainance of discipline within the Society and the avoidance of traveling without the necessary approval and certificate. In 1836, a query was added concerning "an anxious disposition for the accummulation of wealth," and the adherence to the Golden Rule.[29]

---

[28] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 19, 20.

Still another office was that of the overseer, a "faithful and discreet" Friend who was selected by the monthly meeting to watch over his fellow-members.[30] As he was frequently the first to make an effort to reclaim a Friend who had begun to depart from the accepted way of life, he was a key figure in the maintainance of discipline.

Members of the Society of Friends who were about to remove to a new community were to apply to their monthly meeting for certificates establishing their right to membership. If the members were in good standing, the certificate, addressed to the monthly meeting within whose limits the applicant was to live, was to be granted. If a member in good standing removed without obtaining such a certificate, his old monthly meeting was to take the initiative and forward one to his new meeting. Parents and masters and mistresses of slaves and apprentices were to apply for certificates for those under their care. Ministers, but not elders, were to receive certificates indicating their status in the Society.[31]

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 20, 21, 26, 27 and NCYM, Discipline 1836, p. 52.

[30] NCYM, Discipline 1808, p. 23.

Apparently as a result of problems arising out of mass migration of Friends from the state, new provisions were added in 1822. If a certificate were neither used to join a new meeting nor returned to the old one within a year, the member holding it was to be disowned unless there were a good reason for his delay. A member who had misbehaved in other respects than merely removing without taking a certificate was to be disowned; if he had removed to a place within the limits of another meeting, it was to be notified of his shortcoming so that it could either deal with him and bring him back to unity with the Society or disown him.[32]

Members of the Society of Friends were expected to settle their business disputes among themselves without resorting to the courts of law; accordingly, a definite system of arbitration was established. The first step in a dispute over debts, for example, was to be a personal request from the creditor to the debtor to settle the account in question. If this failed to produce results, the request was to be repeated in the presence of one or two of the overseers of the meeting. If the debtor still failed to meet the demand, and there were legitimate issues in dispute, each party was to choose a suitable number of arbitrators, and agree, by bond, to accept their findings. Refusal to accept the counsel of Friends or the decision of the arbitrators, or failure to attend a meeting of the committee without adequate reason, was to result in disownment. Strict instructions were given to insure the impartiality of arbitrators; they were not to consider themselves advocates of those who had chosen them, they were to shun or disregard so far as possible all previous knowledge of the case, they could receive or reject evidence only in the presence of both parties, and they did not need to assign any reason for their decision. The choice of ministers as arbitrators was discouraged.

---

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[32] NCYM, *Discipline*, 1822, pp. 9, 10.

Arbitration was normally a function of the preparative meeting, but if the issue were important, or seemed to be "too hot to handle," it might be passed up to the monthly meeting for decision. Until 1822, non-members could settle disputes with Friends by accepting the same restrictions and techniques.

The above process could well be time-consuming, and sometimes delay could involve financial loss; hence, in certain cases, monthly meetings were authorized to permit or even require resort to civil courts. Among the situations in which such action was allowed were:

a party leaving the country in an effort to defraud, an impending bankruptcy which involved the claims of other parties or the disposition of an estate of substantial value, especially in real estate. However, when legal action was taken, the parties were to behave in such a manner and with such consideration and moderation that their actions would be a testimony to their peaceful nature.[33]

As there was a possibility that a Friend might feel that he had been unjustly treated in the above system of arbitration, a means of appeal was established, by which the case might be carried to the monthly or even the yearly meeting. In such a situation, the meeting which had made the disputed decision sent a delegation to the next higher meeting, together with the case records, which included the evidence upon which the decision had been made. At the level of the quarterly meeting, the committee which was appointed to re-hear the case did not include any members from the meeting whence the appeal had come. Final determination lay with the yearly meeting, from whose decision there was no appeal.[34] Changes made subsequent to 1808 were of minor importance; in 1822 provision was made for returning a case from the quarterly to the monthly meeting when examination showed that the original hearing had not been held in accordance with discipline.[35] In 1836 a phrase was added permitting leaving a Testimony of Disownment at the residence of the member concerned, instead of the former requirement of personal delivery.[36]

---

[33] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 4-7.

[34] Ibid., pp. 3, 4.

As was implied in the treatment of quarrels and arbitration, the Society considered the civil government an agency to be avoided if possible. This concept was strengthened by the prohibition of accepting office in either the state or federal legislature, or as a sheriff, constable, clerk of a court of justice of the peace. Any member who could not be brought to understand the inconsistence of such office-holding was to be disowned.[37] The inconsistency of office-holding would seem to lie in the fact that membership in legislatures involved appropriations for military purposes and court offices included the taking or administering of oaths, all of which were contrary to the Friends' way of life.[38]

---

[35] NCYM, Discipline, 1822, pp. 5,6.

[36] NCYM, Discipline, 1836, p. 14.

[37] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, p. 9.

[38] For a treatment of the problems faced by the Friends in view of their dominant position in the province of Pennsylvania, see Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans, the Colonial Experience (New York: Random House, 1959), Ch. VI-XI, especially VII and VIII.

A further illustration of the same principle was the provision that if a Friend brought a suit against another, or had him arrested, and refused to cancel the action and pay the costs, he was to be disowned, except in cases of necessity.[39] In 1822, this provision was clarified by defining "necessity" in terms of the cases normally settled by arbitration but where legal action was permitted, as noted above.[40]

By far the longest section of the Discipline was that dealing with marriage. It was concerned with the entire process of courtship and marriage from the moment when a Friend first began thinking about the step through the "entertainment" following the ceremony. Disregard of any of the provisions concerning the matter was to result in disownment.

Definite limitations indicated those who might not marry; persons whose former spouse had died within one year, first cousins or others more closely related, and children of half-brothers or half-sisters. Marriage to a person not a member of Society, or to a bond servant or apprentice without the consent of master or mistress was also contrary to discipline. Even attendance at such a wedding, or permitting one's children to attend, was grounds for disownment.

---

[39] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, p. 14.

[40] NCYM, Discipline, 1822, p. 15.

The first step in preparation for marriage was the seeking of divine guidance, through meditation and prayer. After the future spouse had been selected and both parties to the proposed marriage were agreeable, parental consent was to be obtained.

Parents who had given a Friend permission to visit their child or ward with a view to marriage were not to retract that permission without reasons which were acceptable to the monthly meeting. Persons living at a distance from home were to obtain certificates from their own monthly meeting attesting both their right of membership in the society and their freedom from any existing marriage engagements. When both parties were members of the same monthly meeting, the proposed marriage was to be reported in person by the parties to both the male and female members of the congregations gathered in separate meetings for discipline. If parents were present, their consent was to be openly expressed. In both the men's and the women's meeting, committees of two members each were to be appointed to make sure that the member was free from any marriage engagements. If no obstruction appeared, the couple was given liberty to proceed with their intention. A committee was then appointed to attend the wedding and the ensuing entertainment to ensure that good order was maintained, that there was no intemperate eating or drinking and that no unseemly behavior of any kind took place. Further, the party had to break up at a "seasonable" hour.

Marriages were to be solemnized at a service of worship in the meeting-house to which the woman belonged. Toward the close of the service, the couple were to stand up, join hands, and publicly take each other as husband and wife, promising with divine assistance to be faithful and loving spouses as long as they both lived. The marriage certificate, the text of which was prescribed, was then read audibly and was signed, first by the newly married couple, the wife using her married name, then by relatives and finally by as many as chose to subscribe themselves as witnesses.[41]

Subsequent revisions were relatively insignificant. In 1822, provisions were added for marriages to be solemnized on a week-day unless authorized otherwise by the monthly meeting. Slight changes were made in the handling of the certificate.[42] In 1836, the notification to the monthly meeting of a proposed marriage was simplified by having it made in writing instead of in person.[43]

If both parents of a family were members in good standing, their children were received into membership upon the parents' request, but if only one parent made the request, the child could not be admitted to membership until the meeting felt able to receive the youth upon his own request. However, if both parents had been members after marriage, and one had been disowned, the child retained full membership rights. No illegitimate child had a right to membership by birth, and had to be received on his own request.[44]

---

[41] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 14-18.

[42] NCYM, Discipline, 1822, pp. 16, 17.

[43] NCYM, Discipline, 1836, p. 34.

Connection with slavery in any way was strictly forbidden; this included not only owning or dealing in slaves, but hiring them from their owners, acting as executors or administrators of estates including slaves, or being involved in any activity which would prolong the bondage of anyone.[45] In 1836, this section was strengthened by including a prohibition of buying slaves with the intention of sending them to free territory when their services had repaid the purchaser for their cost. It also forbade taking youthful slaves for a time and then returning them to their owners.[46]

The sections of the Discipline which have been surveyed contained the major aspects of the expected standards of conduct. Other provisions are relatively short and of minor significance.

---

[44] NCYM, Discipline, 1836, p. 43.

[45] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 22, 23.

[46] NCYM, Discipline, 1836, p. 23.

Failure to maintain plainness and moderation in speech, gesture, dress and furniture was ground for disownment.[47] Quaker plainness of dress has traditionally been thought of as involving the use of somber colors; that this tradition is not necessarily valid can be seen in a comment of Mary Mendenhall Hobbs, who recalled her great-aunt tell of a man coming to Meeting, dressed in a pea-green Quaker coat and pink pants. She noted that a woman could apparently wear bright colors, so long as the garment was of a proper cut. Apparently the basic consideration was maintaining a style that was at least a quarter of a century out of fashion.[48]

Either taking or administering an oath was a deviation from Quaker principles and hence grounds for disownment.[49]

Members who became involved in war or warlike preparations in any form were to be disowned. Weapons were not to be used in the defense of person or property. Illumination of houses as a token of rejoicing over military victory and the joining of any political association were also banned.[50]

---

[47] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, p. 24.

[48] Mary Mendenhall Hobbs, "Nathan Hunt and His Times," Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia, I (November 1907), 97-98.

[49] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, p. 23.

Members who joined in the celebration of any religious feast, fast or holy day were to be disowned, if admonishment did not induce them to rectify their conduct.[51]

Members of the Society of Friends were to avoid being involved in business which they did not understand or which they had not the ability to manage. Strict integrity in the carrying out of contracts was encouraged. Purchase of any kind of prize goods, or involvement in the movement of any contraband was a reason for disownment.[52] This provision was strengthened in 1822 by the prohibition of all fraudulant or clandestine trade.[53]

"Unnecessary" use of alcoholic beverages, or the distilling, importation or sale of them, or their use at auctions to stimulate bidding were grounds for disownment.[54] As taverns were frequently associated with the sale of intoxicants, Friends were forbidden to frequent them, and tavern-keeping as an occupation was to result in disownment.[55]

---

[50] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 28, 29.

[51] Ibid., p. 11.

[52] Ibid., p. 28.

[53] NCYM, Discipline, 1822, p. 28.

[54] NCYM, Discipline, 1808, pp. 21, 22.

[55] Ibid., p. 27.

A brief section regarding births and burials was concerned primarily with requirements regarding the keeping of proper records, but it also included an injunction against "superfluous" monuments, the wearing or giving of mourning habits and all extravagances in connection with funerals.[56]

All manuscripts were to be submitted to a committee prior to publication; failure to comply was to result in disownment.[57] The apparent reason for this provision was to insure that no Friend published any material which was at variance with accepted doctrine and practice, or which might tend to bring the Society into disrepute.

Persons involved in "dissention, variance or resentment" were to be dealt with by friends in an attempt to secure reconciliation and forgiveness. If this effort failed, the overseers of the congregation were to be informed, and they were to labor with the parties concerned. If they, also, failed, the situation was to be taken to the monthly meeting where a final effort at reconciliation was to be made; failure here was to result in disownment of the guilty party or parties.[58]

Closely connected with the last was the provision that persons involved in such misconduct as "lying, swearing, cursing, men and women unlawfully keeping company with each other" were to be dealt with by the overseers; those who became aware of their offenses and made proper acknowledgement of their fault were continued in fellowship, while those who refused were to be disowned. Doctrinal offenses which were considered evidences of disunity and therefore grounds for disownment included blasphemy, profane speech regarding any of the persons of the Trinity, and denial of the divinity of Christ, the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit or the authenticity of the Bible.[59] The reference to the "immediate presence of the Holy Spirit" is an obvious reference to the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, the immediate guidance of the individual by the Spirit of God.

---

[56] _Ibid._, p. 7.

[57] _Ibid._, p. 8.

[58] _Ibid._, p. 9.

Another section dealing with very personal matters of conduct was that which laid stress upon the danger of "tale-bearing" as a source of strife and discord within the Society. Persons guilty of this fault were to be admonished by friends, the preparative meeting and finally the monthly meeting, which was to disown those who failed to make satisfaction. A person who repeated a tale without being willing or able to identify the source was to be treated as though he were the author of the story.[60]

---

[59] Ibid., pp. 9, 10.

Mention has been made of the prohibition of frequenting taverns. Attendance at stage plays, horse-races, music and dancing, and involvement in any form of gambling were also under the ban, with disownment as the penalty if the guilty party could not be brought to change his ways.[61]

As one surveys the Discipline of Friends, the first and probably the most significant impression gained is the wide scope of human activities which it touched; scarcely a single event of human life, from the recording of a birth to the erection of a monument after death, was outside the interest of the Society of Friends and its Discipline. Limitations in the choice of a marriage partner and the conduct of the wedding ceremony, the selection of an occupation and the integrity with which a man followed it, the way people spoke and dressed and furnished their houses, the maintainance of peace and tranquility among neighbors were all as much matters of concern as the great social issues of slavery, war and temperance. Further, the injunctions of the Discipline were sufficiently precise as to provide both the monthly meeting and the individual member with effective guidance.

---

[60] Ibid., pp. 11, 12.

[61] Ibid., p. 13.

At the same time, it should be noted that the standards of conduct were phrased in advisory rather than mandatory terms so that the local congregation had substantial freedom of action in the administration of church discipline; consistently the phrase used was that offenders "ought to be" rather than "will be" disowned or "testified against."

Secondly, since disownment was the only definitive punishment that was available to the Society of Friends in the enforcement of discipline, it was regarded as a matter of last resort. Reclamation of the offender was much preferred to his expulsion, and with monotonous regularity, friendly counsel and admonition were advised. Even better than reclamation was prevention, and overseers especially were to keep careful watch over their fellow menbers and warn them whenever they seemed to be approaching danger in their conduct.

Further, every effort was made to protect a member against unnecessary or arbitrary disownment. Part of that protection involved the extensive use of counsel and admonition just noted but more important was the provision for appeal from the monthly meeting, where personal antipathies might be important, to the quarterly and even to the Yearly Meeting which embraced not only the Friends of North Carolina but those of neighboring states and where reasonable impartiality might be expected.

After 1822, provision was made for a quarterly meeting to send an appeal back for re-examination when it appeared that the original hearing had not been held in accordance with the _Discipline_.

The Discipline of Friends was remarkable chiefly for the small number of changes made during the period under study. Out of a total of twenty-one sections with a primary emphasis upon ethical or moral standards, only one, that on oaths, was added after 1808, and only two others, dealing with slavery and the Queries respectively, were materially changed. In view of the "approved, priviledged and ancient manner of affirming," it is a little surprising that the prohibition of oaths was not included earlier than 1822. In regard to slavery, the practices that were condemned for the first time in 1836 were the purchase of slaves with the intention of sending them to free territory only after they had worked out their purchase price and the taking of minor children for a time and then returning them to their owners. The changes reflected either the development of new problems or a new concern with old ones. The inclusion of a reference to maintaining the testimony against war coincided with a minor outbreak of disownments for military activities which will be noted more closely later in this paper. It may be remarked here, however, that the addition followed a new phase in the relationship between the Society of Friends and the militia establishment of the State.

Many of the changes that were made in the revisions of the Discipline of Friends in 1822, 1836 and 1854 were merely verbal and did not involve any alteration in basic concept. For example, the edition of 1809 used the words "disown" and "testify against" indiscriminately, while in the 1822 and subsequent editions, "disown" was used exclusively. The 1822 prohibition of "fraudulant or clandestine" trade was largely a clarification of an existing injunction. The 1836 amendment against having alcoholic liquors distilled was merely a prohibition of having others do for a member that which he had been prohibited from doing himself and thus scarcely reflects any expansion of social concern.

Surprisingly there was little or no reflection of many of the moral crusades of the 1830's and 1840's in the revisions of the Discipline during this period. For this omission there are two main reasons; in the earliest Discipline of the North Carolina Meeting, the Society of Friends had already taken such a strong position on social issues which reflected ancient principles that there was little left to say about slavery, war and temperance. Second, governmental action was required in such matters as prison reform, public eduction and the extension of the franchise. Friends had already removed themselves from effective participation in political activity by the prohibition against membership in state or national legislatures and political associations. The general tendency was for the Society to withdraw from active participation in the life of the outside world rather than to seek it; hence many of the reform movements of the day were outside the sphere of either the interest or influence of Friends.

The Disciplinary Experience

The preceding study has dealt with the standards of personal conduct expected of its members by the Society of Friends, specifically those of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting; it is now necessary to explore the disciplinary experience of the Quaker community to ascertain the areas in which violations of the Discipline occurred, and especially to see if any significant geographical or other variations are observable.

The *Discipline of Friends* required that all meetings keep accurate minutes of all matters which came before them or were determined by them.[62] Most of the minute books have been preserved and are currently being kept in the vault of the Quaker Room of the Guilford College Library, Guilford College, North Carolina. William Wade Hinshaw has extracted the essential information from the minute books and the birth, marriage and death records and published them as volume I of the Encyclopedia of American Quaker Geneology.[63] This volume includes the pertinent material from all the mon~~th~~hly meetings on individuals who are, or have been, members of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting. The materials concerning each monthly meeting are of two types: the first, that which was extracted from the records of births, marriages and deaths; the second, the minutes, including accounts of disownments and usually indicating the cause of action. This material is arranged by monthly meetings, in order roughly east to west, within the meetings by family names, and chronologically within families. The material for the ensuing study of disownment was extracted from the Encyclopedia of American Quaker Geneology, but it is arranged in an entirely different manner to meet a different purpose.

---

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Appendix II, pages 253 through 273 presents a tabulation of disownments as recorded in monthly meeting minutes and reported by Hinshaw. Disownments are displayed by monthly meetings by cause per decade during the period 1800-1860. The monthly meetings are considered in approximately geographical order, east to west. Page 274 of Appendix II is a consolidation of the preceding tabulations, indicating total disownments by all meetings, by cause, per decade. The last page of Appendix II is also a consolidation, and presents the disciplinary experience by monthly meetings per decade, with sub-totals for the main geographical areas, the Tidelands and Coastal Plain, the Piedmont, and the lower Mountain region.

---

[63] William Wade Hinshaw, Encyclopedia of American Quaker Geneology VI volumes (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, 1936), vol. I.

As the same format is used for presenting the material for each of the monthly meetings, a few explanatory remarks regarding the form may be in order. The heading "marriage" includes all cases indicated by Hinshaw under the headings of "Marriage contrary to discipline," "marriage out of unity" and "marriage out of Society." As there was no apparent uniformity in the use of the phrases in the original records, they are consolidated here in the interest of uniformity and in order to clarify importance of the marriage aspect of the disciplinary experience of the Friends. Near the bottom of the form is an entry "reported MOU;" this refers to instances of marriage out of unity reported to the monthly meeting, apparently from distant places, and here assumed to have resulted in disownment, although not so stated. "Confessed MOU" refers to cases in which members confessed to having married outside the Society but who had made acceptable acknowledgement of their offense and hence were continued in membership. This category is included in order to present the full picture of the marriage problem. The other headings are largely self-explanatory.

The earliest records available of a meeting in Perquimans County began in 1680. Until 1794 that Meeting was usually referred to as "Perquimans" or "Wells in Perquimans County." At that date, the meeting was divided, a new meeting was set up at Sutton's Creek while the old meeting was transferred to Piney Woods and assumed that name;[64] however, the example of Hinshaw will be followed here and the meeting will be referred to as Perquimans.

The disciplinary record of Perquimans is to be found in Appendix II, 256. Out of the twenty-nine headings of the form, sixteen were used at Perquimans. This indicates a wide variety of causes of disownment. As will be found to be universally true, the most frequent cause indicated was "marriage," accounting for 234 out of 382 cases. In view of the fact that the North Carolina Yearly Meeting had banned the buying and selling of slaves except those bought from other Friends or those bought to prevent the breaking up of families as early as 1772,[65] it is rather surprising to find a total of forty-nine instances of buying, selling, hiring or holding slaves. Such cases continued into the last decade before the Civil War. The third most common cause of disownment at Perquimans was "neglect of meeting," with a total of twenty-two cases, spread fairly evenly throughout the period. A member was frequently disowned for both "lack of plainness" and "gross language," and the final totals, seventeen and eighteen respectively, were almost identical. One of the more interesting variations in frequency of disownment is "joining another Society" (Methodists or Baptists when the denomination was indicated), with no cases in the first two decades, then one each in the next two, and eight in the 1850's, which comprised almost one-half for the entire period in a single decade. This would indicate an increasing breakdown in group solidarity in this particular meeting. In addition, this rather dramatic increase does not parallel the total disownments per decade and thus reflects the increasing importance of this particular problem. Other causes for disownment were relatively minor, being recorded in only a few instances.[66]

---

[64] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 1.

[65] Weeks, Southern Quakers and Slavery, p. 207.

Recorded minutes of the Pasquotank Meeting began in 1699. By the end of the eighteenth century it was referred to as "Symons Creek Monthly Meeting held in Pasquotank County." Members of the Meeting residing in Perquimans County were transferred to Sutton's Creek Monthly Meeting and remained in membership there until the meeting was discontinued in 1835, at which time the remaining members were transferred back to Pasquotank.[67]

---

[66] Appendix II,253.

Pasquotank had an even wider variety of causes for disownment than did Perquimans, with a total of eighteen. Almost half of all cases concerned marriage, with the totals about even through the 1820's, and then a rapid drop-off until there were but two in the 1850's. A total of twelve individuals were disowned for attending unauthorized marriages, all cases arising in the first three decades and over half of them in the third decade alone. Slavery was given as the cause in twenty cases, distributed fairly evenly over the first, second, fourth and fifth decades, but the number was lower, both numerically and relatively, than that of Perquimans. "Neglect of meeting" was a prominent cause for disownment, especially in the first two decades, but then it dropped off to a single case in the 1850's. As in Perquimans, joining another Society did not become a problem until the 1820's when there were three, increasing to four and six cases. "Lack of plainness" was a frequent cause at the beginning of the period, but dropped off rapidly. Other causes of disownment were relatively insignificant. Total cases showed a steady decline throughout the period, and almost disappeared by the 1850's, when there were but three.[68]

---

[67] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 91, 92.

[68] Appendix II, 254.

It has previously been noted that Suttons Creek was set off from Pasquotank in 1794 and discontinued in 1835; thus this study includes almost the entirety of its organized life. Not only was its membership drawn from Pasquotank, but its disciplinary experience was closely parallel. With fewer than 250 cases, 16 causes were identified. Marriage was responsible for over half of all disownments, with frequency very uniform, except for the second decade. Especially in the early years, Suttons Creek members must have been particularly profane, for fifteen of them were disowned for "gross language," eleven of them in the first two decades. Removal without having secured a certificate of membership with five cases showed up for the first time in this study, but joining another Society almost disappeared. Neglect of meeting became highly important, especially in the closing years of the Meeting. Suttons Creek was able to solve its slavery problem fairly early, as all nine cases in this category occurred in the first twenty years. Considering the fact that the Meeting was discontinued in 1835, both total disownments and those for marriage were relatively uniform in cases per decade, with a low point in the decade 1810-1819.[69]

Rich Square Monthly Meeting, in Northampton County, in the Coastal Plain rather than the Tidelands area, was organized in 1760, the year in which it completed the construction of its meeting house. A portion of its membership was organized as Jack Swamp Meeting in 1794, but that meeting was discontinued in 1812 and its remaining members returned to Rich Square. Accordingly, data from Jack Swamp is consolidated with that of Rich Square, again following the example of Hinshaw.[70]

---

[69] *Ibid.*, 255.

Rich Square disowned a total of 147, 66 of them for offenses involving marriage, 9 each for involvement with slavery and lack of plainness, 8 for neglect of meeting. Four joined other Societies and four attended marriages out of unity. The remaining cases were scattered over a wide range of causes, a total of sixteen categories being identified. The number of cases per decade was highest in 1810-1819 with forty, then dropped rapidly to twelve in the fifth decade and then more than doubled in the 1850's. Four cases of confessed marriage out of unity were recorded.[71]

Core Sound was a small meeting during the period covered by this study, partly because it suffered a heavy migration to Ohio in the first decade of the century.[72]

---

[70] Appendix II, 256.

[71] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 279.

[72] Appendix II, 282.

As a result, only fifty-five were disowned, eighteen of them for causes not stated. Of the remaining thirty-seven cases, twenty-seven were for marriage, four for joining another Society, one each for slavery, misuse of certificate of membership and there were three who were reported to have married out of unity. Frequency of disownment did not vary widely from the average.[73]

Contentnea Monthly Meeting, about fifteen miles north of Goldsboro in Wayne County, was established in 1748 as a result of migration of Friends inland.[74] The recording clerks at Contentnea were not as conscientious in indicating causes of disownment as one might wish; in 87 out of 220 cases, no reason was stated. Of the remaining 143, over two-thirds grew out of unauthorized marriages. The next most frequent cause, accounting for twelve cases, was joining another Society. Removal accounted for five and military activities for four. Slavery, lack of plainness, unsettled debts and reported marriage out of unity provided one or two each. For the first time in this study, there were a substantial number of confessed marriages out of unity, twenty-two in all, concentrated largely in the last two decades.[75]

---

[73] Appendix II, 257.

[74] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 279.

[75] Appendix II, 258.

Neuse Meeting, also in Wayne County, about six miles west of Goldsboro, had been in existence as a place of worship since 1785, but it was not set up as a Monthly Meeting until 1841.[76] Its disciplinary experience, including but thirteen cases, was very limited. In seven cases, the cause was not stated; of the remaining six, four were for marriage and one each for slavery and military actions. Five confessed marriage out of unity and were retained in membership.[77]

With Cane Creek Monthly Meeting, we begin the study of the massive Friends settlement in the Piedmont area. The meeting, which was located fifteen miles south of Graham in what is now Alamance County, was established in 1751.[78] Out of the 227 disownments for which the cause was stated, 217 were for marriage and in addition there were 57 cases of reported marriages out of unity; that left only three to be divided between removal and joining another society. Put another way, about ninety-nine per cent of all disownments in Cane Creek Meeting, when the cause was indicated, were for marriage. In addition, 59 confessed to having been married out of unity. The greatest number of disownments, 125, were in the first decade, after which there was a gradual decline to a final figure of 35.[79]

---

[76] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 321.

[77] Appendix II, 259.

[78] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 343.

Spring Monthly Meeting was located in southeastern Alamance County, fifteen miles south-east of Graham and a few miles east of Cane Creek. A place of worship was established in 1773 and the Meeting was organized twenty years later.[80] Out of 98 disownings, causes were assigned for 70; of these, 50 were for unauthorized marriages, and there were an additional 10 "reported" cases. Late in the period covered by this study, five joined other societies, and two moved away without certificates. Again, almost all disownings for which the cause was indicated were in connection with marriage. Again, too, there was a large number who married non-Quakers but who remained in membership, 43 in all. Except during the last two decades, the number of disownments varied but little, averaging about twenty per decade.[81]

Holly Spring Meeting, in Randolph County, was set up in 1818; prior to that date, it had been a place of worship for part of the Cane Creek Meeting.[82] In contrast to the last few Meetings studied, Holly Springs members offended in a rather wide variety of ways, a total of fifteen categories being identified. Of the 103 disownments, the cause was indicated in all but 12. Of the remaining 91 cases, 51 were for marriage contrary to discipline, 8 for joining another Society, 9 for military actions (nearly all in the fourth decade) and the remainder for a wide variety of reasons. One pair of cases involved a man and his wife, she being disowned for jealousy and he for causing her to be jealous![83] Since the record clerks at Holly Spring were more careful to indicate causes than those at neighboring meetings, it could well be that the experience of this meeting was more realistically portrayed than was generally true in the Piedmont; this in turn might suggest that marriage was not actually as prominent a cause of disownment as the records seem to indicate.

---

[79] Appendix II, 260.

[80] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 431.

[81] Appendix II, 261.

[82] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 457.

New Garden Monthly Meeting was established in Guilford County in 1754.[84] The recorders here were very lax in noting the cause of disownments; no cause was indicated in 160 out of 393 cases, or over 40 per cent. Among the indicated causes were eight instances of removal, three of involvement in slavery (all in the first decade) and one for military action. Members who married outside the Society but who made acknowledgement and continued their membership numbered 125. Over half the disownments occurred during the first twenty years of the period covered by this study; the rate remained rather constant thereafter.[85]

---

[83] Appendix II, 262.

[84] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 487.

Dover, set up in 1815 and located in the same general area about five or six miles north-west of New Garden,[86] reflects a similar situation; its records indicate 53 marriages out of unity, 39 reported marriages out of unity, and 48 cases in which the cause was not stated. No other categories were noted. The number of cases was remarkably uniform until the last decade, when it dropped by about one-third. Possibly the most question-provoking aspects of the records at Dover is the complete absence of any confessed marriages out of unity.[87] In the other meetings of the Piedmont area which we have studied we have found that from about one-fifth to almost one-half of those who married outside the Society, or at least contrary to its discipline, confessed their fault and remained in membership.

Hopewell Monthly Meeting, in Guilford County about four miles west of New Garden, was established as a place of worship in 1793, but was not set up as a separate meeting until 1824. In 1849 it was discontinued and its members joined New Garden.[88] As was true of the Piedmont meetings generally, the cause of a large number of disownments (26 out of 72) was not noted. Of those causes which were indicated, all but one were connected with marriage. The number of cases varied little from decade to decade.[89]

---

[85] Appendix II, 263.

[86] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 585.

[87] Appendix II, 264.

Records of Center Meeting, set up in Guilford County ten miles south of Greensboro in 1773,[90] were somewhat more complete in that they indicated the cause of more than two-thirds of all cases; all but four were for marriage, and one of these was a "reported marriage out of unity." Again, a large number, thirty, confessed unauthorized marriages and remained in fellowship with the Society. Taking into account the incompleteness of the records prior to 1835, the number of cases per decade was relatively stable until the last decade, when there was a sharp drop.[91]

Back Creek, another Randolph County meeting established in 1792,[92] was located a few miles west of Asheboro.

---

[88] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 599.

[89] Appendix II, 265.

[90] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 645. Men's records available only from 1835, women's from 1825.

[91] Appendix II, 266.

[92] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 695.

Again, the cause was not stated for approximately forty per cent of the disownments, and of those indicated, all but three involved marriage. Only three persons confessed unauthorized marriages, all of them in the first decade. Well over one-fourth of all disownments occurred during the first ten years, after which there was a decline from ninety to less than thirty cases in the last decade.[93]

The recording clerks at Marlboro were even less careful than those at Back Creek when it came to indicating causes for disownment, omitting this information in more than half of the cases they reported. Of the causes that were mentioned, all but three were for marriage. The number of cases increased rapidly from the establishment of the meeting in 1816 until it reached its apex in the 1840's, after which it dropped off even more rapidly. The number of confessed marriages out of unity was very high, exceeding the total disownment in two different decades, but there was but one reported unauthorized marriage in the first decade.[94]

Deep River Meeting, a leading center of Friends' activity, was located in Guilford County about twelve miles west of Greensboro. A mid-week meeting had been established in 1753, a preparative meeting five years later and the Monthly Meeting was formally organized in 1778. Its experience was similar to that of New Garden, in that both meetings benefited from a heavy migration of Friends from Pennsylvania in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and both suffered severe losses in removal to the Mid-west in the period from 1800 to the outbreak of the Civil War.[95]

---

[93] Appendix II, 267.

[94] Ibid., 268.

Disownments at Deep River totalled 345, of which 184 were for offenses involving marriage, 137 were for causes unstated, 6 for joining other societies, 5 for removal and the remaining 4 for different reasons. Only 9 were reported to have married out of unity, but 81 confessed that offense and made satisfaction to the meeting. The rate per decade for these last two categories was relatively uniform in contrast to a sharp decline experienced in other offenses; almost two-thirds of the disownments for marriage occurred in the first twenty years, after which there was a sharp decline. One-quarter of the "cause not stated" cases came in the first decade. Taken together, 190 out of the total of 345 disownments took place in the period 1800-1819.[96]

Springfield Meeting, established in Guilford County as a place of worship in 1773, was set up as a monthly meeting in 1790.[97] Its disciplinary experience followed what had become a pattern in the Piedmont area; a high proportion of cases in which the cause for disownment was not indicated, marriage almost universally involved when the reason was noted, and a very high number of confessed marriages out of unity. No pattern however is observable in the incidence rate except that there were peaks in the second and fifth decades.[98]

---

[95] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 773.

[96] Appendix, II, 269.

Although Union was established as a preparative meeting as early as 1785, its formal organization did not take place until 1818, and it was closed in 1834, when its remaining members were transferred to Dover Meeting.[99] As might be expected in view of its short organizational life, Union had a small number of disownments, only 48, of which 28 were in the period 1818-1829. Reasons were not indicated in over half the actions, and marriage was the only cause noted. There were no reported nor confessed marriages out of unity, a fact which makes Union somewhat unusual.[100]

With Westfield Monthly Meeting, in Surry County, our study moves out of the Piedmont area into the region of the lower mountains. The meeting was set up in 1786, original members coming largely from New Garden. The meeting only lasted until 1832, and records are very scant, with minutes of men's meetings available only through 1828, and no women's minutes at all.[101] Causes were reported in only eighteen out of seventy-nine cases of disownment, with over half of these being for marriage; one action was taken for removal and five for military activity. Over half of the disownments were in the first decade and only five between 1820 and 1832. As was true in the case of Union, there were no instances recorded of reported or confessed marriages out of unity.[102]

---

[97] Hinshaw, _Quaker_ _Geneology_, I, 847.

[98] _Appendix_, II, 270.

[99] Hinshaw, _Quaker_ _Geneology_, I, 907.

[100] _Appendix_, II, 271.

Deep Creek Meeting, located in Yadkin County, set up in 1793,[103] had a slightly wider range of disciplinary problems, with a total of 17 out of 212 cases not being concerned with marriages, 6 of them being for removal and 7 for joining another society. This, however, left 195 cases that did involve marriage, not counting the 78 who confessed marriage out of unity and thus were not disowned. A peak in the number of disownments per decade was reached in the years 1810-1819 which accounted for two out of every seven cases in the meeting. There were but six reported marriages out of unity, well distributed over the period under study, as were the 78 confessed unauthorized marriages.[104]

---

[101] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 952.

[102] Appendix, II, 272.

[103] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 971.

The study of the disciplinary experience of the individual meetings is now complete; the next phase of the exploration of Quaker Church Discipline is to put the total together to obtain the over-all picture. _Appendix_ II, 277 is a compilation of all disownments by all montly meetings, per decade and by cause, from 1800 to 1860.

The most obvious fact to emerge from the evidence is the overwhelming importance of marriage as a cause of disownment. Out of a total of 2915 actions for which cause was indicated, 2074 involved marriage contrary to discipline or out of unity or Society. To this figure may be added the 290 instances in which marriage out of unity was reported to the meeting but where disownment 5
was not specifically stated, and the total number of cases directly involving marriage rises to 2394 or 82 per cent of the total. Even this figure does not include the 832 persons who married out of unity but who confessed their fault and thus were retained in membership. Such a massive concentration of disownment in one category of offense demands explanation; obviously the possibility

---

[104] _Appendix_, II, 273.

of being disowned was not an effective deterrent to marriage to a non-Quaker.

One of the primary causes for such a wide-spread disregard of the Friends' requirements regarding marriage was the concept of "birthright membership." George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, was himself a highly effective preacher, and this fact, coupled with the simplicity and practical nature of his program, soon won him thousands of convinced followers.[105] This may be called the "evangelistic era" of Quakerism. However, an entirely new factor was soon introduced into the situation. At the London Yearly Meeting of 1737, in the interest of guaranteeing the rights of widows and orphans of deceased Friends to the financial relief of the Society, it was agreed that the wives and children of members should be considered as members themselves, and that such relationship should not be terminated by the death of the husband and father.[106] Up to this time, the Society of Friends had been a fellowship based upon personal conviction, but now membership was made a family affair, without regard for individual religious devotion.[107] In the ensuing years, the enforcement of discipline became more important than either evangelism or the indoctrination of the membership, and the overseers, responsible for the moral conduct of the members, dominated the Society rather than the ministers.[108]

---

[105] Weeks, Southern Quakers, p. 4.

[106] Anscombe, I Have Called You Friends, p. 47.

[107] Elbert Russell, The Story of Quakerism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942), p. 216.

A second major cause of the break-down in adherence to the required marriage within the Society was the failure to change birthright members into personally committed ones. For this, several factors were responsible. One was the neglect of Bible teaching. The Discipline encouraged the reading of the Scriptures, but Bibles were expensive and many families did not own a copy, or at best only a portion of the text. Also, reading, except when a person was moved by the inward spirit to do so, was objected to as being mere formalism. Bible schools were unknown, and religious instruction was left to the parents who were often reluctant to assume the responsibility, partly out of a desire not to interfere with the working of the "Inner Light," and partly because of their own ignorance. Even the services of worship did not meet the need for religious instruction. Sermons were few and often not effective, because the preparation of a sermon was frowned upon as "creaturely activity," and the use of mystical language made comprehension difficult if not impossible. As a result, Friends tended to become members by tradition rather than by personal conviction.[109] This increasing dependence upon the guidance of the "Inner Light" resulted also in a lessened sense of the importance of Scripture reading and Biblical preaching, and the younger generation was left without either Biblical knowledge or effective guidance in the doctrines of the Society.[110] Again, there was little in the procedures of the worship services of the Friends to arouse affection for the Society on the part of the youthful Quaker. No provision was made for them apart from the regular meeting and the experience of sitting motionless, with feet dangling in mid-air for an hour of absolute silence was burdensome, to say the least.[111]

---

[108] Thomas, A History of Friends in America, pp. 120, 121.

These two factors, membership by inheritence and tradition rather than by religious conviction, and the lack of an effective program of indoctrination that would awaken individual devotion and conviction, produced in time a generation which contained many who were Friends in little more than name. Accordingly, when a choice had to be made between an attractive marriage outside the Society on one hand and adherence to the Discipline on the other, well over three thousand in

---

[109] Ibid., pp. 121, 122. Also Anscombe, I Have Called You Friends, p. 73.

[110] Russell, A History of Quakerism, p. 281.

[111] Anscombe, I Have Called You Friends, p. 71.

North Carolina alone defied the demands of their church and married outside the Society. Further, of this number, only one-fourth took the not especially difficult or embarassing step of confessing their shortcoming and thus remaining in membership.

Earlier in this dissertation mention was made of the ancient testimony of the Society of Friends against the institution of slavery. In North Carolina, trading in slaves had been prohibited among Friends, except for humanitarian reasons, as early as 1772. In the Discipline of 1808, all involvement with slavery was strictly forbidden; yet slavery was one of the most frequently cited grounds for expulsion, as indicated in the following table:

TABLE 1

Meeting	1800-1810	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Perquimans	10	12	5	8	4	2	41
Pasquotank	7	4		4	5		20
Suttons Creek	5	3					8
Rich Square	2	2	2			1	7
Core Sound		1					1
Contentnea		1			1		2
Neuse						1	1
New Garden	3						3
Deep River		1					1
Totals	27	24	7	12	10	4	84

It appears that although disownment for slavery was most frequent during the early years of the period under study, it continued to occur up to the eve of the Civil War. Perhaps more significant is the fact that such disownments were largely concentrated in the meetings in the Tidewater region--Perquimans, Pasquotank, Suttons Creek and Core Sound, which accounted for seventy of the eighty-four cases. Contentnea, Rich Square and Neuse, all located somewhat inland had only ten. The entire large Quaker settlement in the Piedmont region, including the meetings of Cane Creek, Spring, Holly Spring, New Garden, Dover, Hopewell, Center, Back Creek, Marlboro, Deep River, Springfield and Union had but four, and these were early in the period.

Two main factors contributed to this major geographical variation; one was the fact that climatic and soil conditions were more favorable to a slave economy along the Coast, increased the temptation to violate the Discipline, the other was that Alamance, Randolph and Guilford counties were the main centers of anti-slavery sentiment among the Friends. The Meeting for Sufferings, which took a leading role in the colonization of Free Negroes,[112] held its annual sessions at Deep Creek Meeting

---

[112] North Carolina Manumission Society Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

House.[113] Examination of the Minutes of the North Carolina Manumission Society reveals that although it was not an official organization of the Friends, it was largely dominated by Quakers from the Piedmont area. Sessions were held at such places as Deep Creek, New Garden, Center, Hopewell, all of them Friends' Meeting Houses. Local units represented at the meeting of August 27, 1819, for instance included Deep Creek, Center, New Garden, Carraway, Reedy Fork and Springfield.[114] One of the larger sessions met at Center in September, 1826. Among others, local branches in attendance included New Garden, Center, Deep River, Springfield, Cane Creek, Jamestown, Union, Dover, Westfield. Names frequently encountered in the Minutes of the meetings were such familiar Quaker names as Hunt, Swaim, Mendenhall, Henley and Nixon.[115]

Bracketed just above and below slavery as causes for disownment were two closely allied offenses, neglect of meeting and joining another society. The first appeared eighty-six times, the latter eighty-two. The totals of the two offenses combined varied no more than two per decade from the average, except in the 1830's when the variation went up to five. But while disownments for joining another society increased almost steadily throughout the period, those for neglect of meeting dropped with even greater regularity.[116]

---

[113] NCYM, Discipline, 1854, p. 28.

[114] "Minutes, North Carolina Manumission Society," typescript copy, p. 17, North Carolina Manumission Society Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

[115] *Ibid.*, *passim*.

The offenses already noted, marriage, involvement with slavery, neglect of meeting and joining another society, were the only categories which produced an average of more than one case per year for the period covered by this study. Of the remaining causes, lack of plainness in dress and speech with fifty-three cases was the most important, followed by removing without taking a certificate of membership with forty-nine and military activities with forty-six. Of these, lack of plainness and especially removal showed a rather steady drop in frequency, but the item dealing with military actions demands further comment.

Examination of the tabulation of all disownings by cause per decade reveals two peaks of actions based upon military activity. The first is easily explained since it occurred in the second decade and thus coincided with the War of 1812, but the later peak, in the 1830's requires further study.[117]

In 1786, the North Carolina General Assembly passed legislation exempting Quakers, Mennonites, Moravians and Dunkers from the obligation of taking military training because of their conscientious scruples against bearing arms.[118] In 1830, the Legislature repealed this exemption but added a provision that a member of any religious denomination which made bearing arms a religious matter might secure exemption from military training by the payment of a special tax of two dollars and fifty cents. Machinery was set up for the collection of the tax and the registration of conscientious objectors by local militia commanders.[119]

---

[116] Appendix, II, 274.

[117] Ibid.

Reaction within the Society of Friends to the new legislation was immediate. The North Carolina Meeting for Sufferings, which served as an executive committee of the Yearly Meeting between sessions of that body, published a protest to the tax. This document took the position that while the Meeting encouraged the prompt payment of taxes and the performance of public duties, it desired that Friends should maintain their testimony against all war and "fightings" and to avoid any compliance with the provisions of the Act of 1830. Friends were also advised not to purchase property which had been confiscated because failure to comply with the law.[120].

---

[118] Weeks, Southern Quakers, p. 194.

[119] Acts Passed by the General Assembly of North Carolina at the Session of 1830-31 (Raleigh, N.C.: Lawrence and Lemay, Printers to the Senate, 1831) p. 28ff.

This was followed by a Memorial from the Yearly Meeting to the General Assembly in 1832. This Memorial recounts the historic Quaker testimony against war, based upon the teachings of Christ and the experience of believers in the first three centuries of Christian history. It points out that Friends had never born arms but that they peacefully submitted to any penalties assessed against them for their refusal to do so. Repeal of all legislation providing for exemption from militia duty is respectfully requested, and reference is made to the fact that Quakers had been among the earliest settlers in the State, and that they had always been honest, industrious and peaceable citizens. The Memorial goes on to affirm the belief of the Friends that civil government was of divine institution and that active obedience to all laws which did not conflict with conscience was obligatory upon them. The authors indicate that they felt religiously bound to submit to any penalties imposed for non-compliance, and that their only efforts at redress would be limited to remonstrance and entreaty.[121]

---

[120] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, From the Meeting for Sufferings (Greensboro, N.C.: William Swaim, 1831), p. 1.

As a result of the protests by the Society of Friends, the General Assembly, at its next session, repealed the Act of 1830 so far as it pertained to persons with religious scruples against bearing arms, and provided that such individuals should register with the militia captain in whose district they lived, presenting him with a certificate showing their membership in a pacifist church, and making oath or affirmation of their religious scruples against bearing arms. Such persons were to be subject to taxation in times of invasion or insurrection and to provide quotas of men or pay an equivalent fee. Militia captains were required to list all Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites and Dunkers between the ages of eighteen and forty-five in their muster lists, but were not to compel them to take training or perform any military duty except in case of insurrection or invasion or to pay any tax to secure such exemption.[122]

Thus the Society of Friends was able to secure official recognition of their stand against war, but in the meantime, especially in Perquimans and Holly Springs Meetings, there was a number of Friends who participated in military training or at least attended musters and were disowned for their violation of the ancient Quaker testimony.[123]

---

[121] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, A Memorial to the General Assembly of North Carolina (No Imprint, [1832?]).

[122] Acts Passed by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1832-33 (Raleigh, N.C.: Charles R. Ramsey, Printer to the Senate, 1833), p. 10.

Other causes of disownment were of minor importance, but may call for a word of comment. Disownment for gross language took place a little more than once a year in the average in the first decade, largely in the Coastal meetings, but then declined steadily until it disappeared entirely in the 1850's. Attendance at marriage ceremonies contrary to discipline attained a peak of thirteen in the 1820's and then fell off to four, one and zero. Unsettled debts, usually on the part of members who had migrated, were concentrated in the first decade and then became insignificant. The same was true of attendance at theatrical and other unauthorized diversions, which disappeared as a cause of disownment by the middle of the period. Dancing was the most common specific cause, although one was disowned for "owning a fiddle." Other causes were very insignificant, with half a dozen or fewer cases which were so scattered as to time and place of occurance as to make no observeable pattern.[124]

This survey has been concerned with those cases in which adherence to discipline broke down to the point where disownment became necessary; it might be of interest to note those provisions of the Discipline of Friends that never became grounds for disciplinary action, although there may have been a few violations which were reflected in the use of such general terms as "misconduct" or "not keeping to Friends' principles." Among such non-used sections of the Discipline were those dedicated to books, observance of religious feasts, fasts and holy days, defamation and detraction, moderation and temperence, oaths and taverns. Of these, the absence of disownment for intemperence is probably the most interesting, especially in view of the testimony of Mary Mendenhall Hobbs that most families in this period had tubs of locusts and persimmons brewing to make locust beer, and that they kept barrels of stronger, home-made fluids in their cellars. Meetings appropriated funds to purchase whiskey or brandy for members who were too poor to buy it for their harvesters.[125] Apparently this came under the heading of "necessary use" of alcohol. However, it may be noted that when the printed Minutes of the Yearly Meeting began in 1848 to include the precise number of Friends over eighteen years of age who used alcohol for other than medicinal purposes, the figure ran between five and ten per cent of all those who had been surveyed.[126]

---

[123] Appendix ~~II~~, 253 and 254.

[124] Ibid., 274.

---

[125] Mary Mendenhall Hobbs, "Nathan Hunt and His Times," Bulletin of the Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia, I, (Nov. 1907), 97.

The Migration

The major task remaining in the study of the Society of Friends is to determine the relative importance of disownment and migration as sources of membership loss among the Quakers during the pre-Civil War period. In an effort to make such an assessment, Hinshaw's Quaker Geneology will again be depended upon because the Minutes from which he extracted essential information included data concerning certificates of membership granted to Friends about to move to new homes.[127]

Migration from Perquimans Monthly Meeting was very slight in the first decade with only four, of whom two went to the Virginia-Maryland area, but it picked up rapidly in the second decade with sixty-four, divided almost equally between Ohio and Indiana as destinations. The pattern remained irregular from that time, with a high point in the 1830's. Migration to Ohio continued through the 1840's, but on a reduced scale.[128]

---

[126] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, Minutes of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends (various publishers), passim.

[127] The pertinent information is displayed in Appendix III, pages 281 through 301. An explanation of the forms used may be in order. Data from each montly meeting is presented in the same order as in Appendix II, arranged by destination and by decades. Certificates for man and wife were counted as two individuals. When the entry read "John Doe and children," it was counted as a family certificate. The number of persons in one hundred family groups in which names were given was counted and the average was found to be 5.49 per family; hence a multiplication factor of 5.5 was used to convert family certificates to a reasonably accurate estimate of the total number of individuals concerned. Early migrants to Ohio took certificates to meetings in southwestern Pennsylvania; accordingly, these were included in data for Ohio, which may inflate these figures, but not to an appreciable degree.

Pasquotank Monthly Meeting migration was quite similar to that of Perquimans, with a large increase upon the opening of Indiana to settlement in the second decade. Movement to Ohio was confined to the first twenty years and dropped to a much greater degree than was true in Perquimans.[129]

Migration from Suttons Creek did not start until the second decade, which produced a mass movement to Indiana. A few individuals followed in the 1820's, and then another large movement resulted in the closing of the meeting in 1835.[130]

Rich Square experienced a much more extensive migration than any of the meetings so far noted, and the movement was to a wider range of destinations, including not only Ohio and Indiana but also Tennessee and Iowa. A much larger proportion of the migration took place in the first decade, almost all of it going to Ohio. Movement from Rich Square was mostly accomplished by 1830; only 40 out of 283 left after that date.[131]

---

[128] Appendix, III, 278.

[129] Ibid., 279.

[130] Ibid., 280.

Core Sound Meeting had two separate waves of migration, one of 130 to Ohio in the first decade, the other to Indiana in the 1830's which brought the meeting to an end.[132]

Exactly half of those who migrated from Contentnea did so in the third decade. Secondary peaks appeared in the first decade when sixty-three moved to Ohio, and in the fourth with seventy to Indiana. Total migration was 398, including 14 to Illinois and 11 to Iowa.[133]

Neuse Meeting had such a short existence in the period covered by this study that its figure, three, was entirely insignificant.[134]

If the migration from Neuse was meaningless, that from Cane Creek was massive, 1243, with over 300 in each of the first and third decades and over 200 in the second and fourth. Movement after 1840 was relatively slight. Certificates in the first decade were almost universally issued to meetings in Ohio, but after that almost all the migration went to Indiana. Tennessee, Illinois,

---

[131] _Ibid._, 281.

[132] _Ibid._, 282.

[133] _Ibid._, 283.

[134] _Ibid._, 284.

Kansas and Iowa received a few scattered immigrants from Cane Creek.[135]

Migration from Spring Monthly Meeting started slowly with only forty in the first decade, twenty-nine to Ohio and eleven to Tennessee. The next three decades were times of extensive movement, with estimated totals averaging 150 for each ten year period. The last twenty years studied showed little migration. The usual pattern as to destination held firm. Most emigrants went to Ohio in the first decade but a mass migration to Indiana began in the second decade. Scattered certificates were given for Tennessee, Iowa and other locations. The estimated total was 530.[136]

Movement from Holly Springs Meeting was entirely to Indiana except for a few who went to Iowa. The meeting was not set up until 1818, when migration to Ohio had largely stopped. Removals per decade were very uneven, with a peak in the 1830's with 106, followed immediately by the low point of 21. Estimated total was 232.[137]

The pattern of migration from New Garden was quite similar to its neighbor Cane Creek, except that there was a twenty-year peak from 1810 to 1829 when almost five hundred removed each decade. Then came a rapid decline to seventy-seven followed by an increase to 177 in the final ten years. There was a heavy migration to Ohio, an estimated total of 310, in the first decade with only a slight drop in the following ten years. The heaviest movement to Indiana came in the 1820's with almost five hundred removals. Movement to other destinations was slight. New Garden's loss by migration was greater than that of any other meeting, reaching an estimated total of 1788.[138]

---

[135] Ibid., 285.

[136] Ibid., 286.

[137] Ibid., 287.

Except for two individuals, all certificates from Dover were issued to meetings in Ohio and Indiana. Movement to Ohio continued at a relatively high rate much longer than was true in most other meetings. A total of 174 migrated, approximately one-fourth of them to Ohio, practically all the rest to Indiana. Over two-thirds of all certificates were issued between 1820 and 1839.[139]

The entire contingent of emigrants from Hopewell Monthly Meeting, slightly under two hundred, went to Indiana. The number of certificates per decade was very even, never deviating far from the average of 66 each ten years.[140]

---

[138] Ibid., 288.

[139] Ibid., 289.

[140] Ibid., 290.

Except for one family to Ohio and three families and two individuals to Iowa, all the people who left Center Meeting went to Indiana.[141] Although the meeting was established in 1773, Minutes of the Men's Meeting are not available prior to 1835, nor those of the Women's Meeting before 1825.[142] This lack of early records may well be responsible for distortion of the over-all picture regarding emigration from Center.

Migration from Back Creek Meeting was concentrated in the first four decades of the period under study, and especially in the first twenty years. The first ten years saw a mass migration to Ohio which was replaced in the next decade by the removal of well over two hundred to Indiana. There were scattered certificates issued to meetings in Tennessee in the first and fourth decades, and a few to Kansas and Iowa in the last. Migration was most rapid in 1818-1819, then dropped to almost half and eventually almost disappeared, only twenty-three moving in the 1840's and fifty-two in the 1850's. Final estimated total was 813.[143]

Marlboro migration was entirely to Indiana, with over half of a final total of 445 removing in the 1830's.

---

[141] Ibid., 291.

[142] Hinshaw, Quaker Geneology, I, 645.

[143] Appendix III, 292.

Less than thirty moved in the third and fifth decades, with approximately seventy each, in the second and sixth. In evaluating these figures, it must be remembered that this meeting was not established until 1816, so it is seen that movement during the final years of that decade were relatively high.[144]

Deep River experienced a migration of almost 900. Again the rate per decade was very uneven, ranging from 306 in the second decade to 23 in the fifth. As usual, the 1850's saw a marked increase in movement, totalling almost 80. Destinations included almost all areas except Kansas, but more than two-thirds went to Indiana.[145]

Except for some early movement to the Virginia-Maryland area, Springfield Meeting certificates were all issued to meetings in Ohio or Indiana. Migration to Ohio was concentrated in the first decade, but continued to a limited degree through the 1840's. Movement was especially heavy 1810-1839, but then it virtually stopped, only to revive in the 1850's. Estimated total was 922.[146]

Union Meeting was an organized unit for only sixteen years, but it still suffered a migration of over three hundred members, all of them except two families going to either Ohio or Indiana. Rate of movement was relatively stable through the short life of the meeting.[147]

---

[144] *Ibid.*, 293.

[145] *Ibid.*, 294.

[146] *Ibid.*, 295.

Almost one-fifth of the migration from Westfield Meeting went to Tennessee, which may be explained by the fact that Westfield was in mountainous Surry County and some of its members may therefore have been attracted to the mountains of Tennessee. Heaviest movement took place in the first decade, but a revival of migration in the years 1820-1832 brought about the end of the meeting.[148]

Deep Creek sent a few emigrants to Tennessee, but during the first decade 125 went to Ohio, followed by another 105 in the succeeding ten years. Mass movement to Indiana began in the second decade with 175; 123 followed in the 1820's. After that time, there was a rapid decline in the number of certificates that were issued until there were but three in the 1850's. Overall, 1810-1819 saw the most active movement with an estimated 183. Final total was 716.[149]

Pages 302 to 304 of Appendix III are consolidations of migration statistics, the former indicating source, the latter destination, of Friends who left North Carolina during the period 1800-1860. In each case, geographical sub-totals are included.

---

[147] Ibid., 296.

[148] Ibid., 297.

[149] Ibid., 298.

Regional sub-totals, and hence the grand totals, show a consistent pattern of extensive migration during the first four decades, with a peak in the second or third, a drop of about seventy-five per cent in the fifth decade, and then a sharp increase in the years just before the Civil War. The chief exception was the western area, which had its peak in the second decade, after which migration dropped steadily. Almost four-fifths of the migration came from the Piedmont area, the meetings of Cane Creek and New Garden alone accounting for almost one-third of the entire movement. A further significant point is that the Quaker migration reached its peak before 1830, the time when slavery began to become an emotional issue with the publication of Garrison's Liberator, the development of the Abolitionist movement and the Nat Turner insurrection. This may suggest that tensions between Friends and their neighbors over the slavery issue may not have been as significant a factor in producing the Quaker migration as has been assumed.

Figures on the total migration to specific destinations are provided in the following table:[150]

---

[150] Ibid., 301.

TABLE 2

Destination	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1859	Totals
Ohio	1582	641	143	52	19	9	2446
Indiana	10	1774	2256	2127	486	750	7403
Va. and Md.	82	10	22	1	1	2	118
Tenessee	92	20		11	5	2	130
Illinois					5		5
Kansas						12	12
Iowa			11	6	17	76	110
All others	16	2	1	11	2	5	37

It is thus seen that almost the entire migration to Ohio took place in the first twenty years, with about two-thirds of it in the first ten. Migration to Indiana was entirely insignificant in the first decade but in the second it became a flood that continued for thirty years. Movements to the Virginia-Maryland area were largely concentrated in the first twenty years with the bulk of it in the years before 1810. Migration to Iowa preceeded that to Kansas and was more substantial. Movement in other directions, mostly to Philadelphia and New England, was slight and scattered and thus established no definite pattern.

Combining the statistics displayed on pages 278, 302 and 304 of Appendix II and III makes possible a determination of the relative importance of disownment and migration as causes of membership loss in the Society of Friends during the period undersstudy. This comparison is presented on pages 305, 306 of Appendix III. The first and second columns are self-explanatory; the ratio in column three results from dividing the number of disownments by the number of persons who moved from the State.

Examination of these statistics immediately shows a sharp geographical difference. In those meetings in the northern part of the coastal area, Perquimans, Pasquotank and Suttons Creek, disownment was substantially more important than migration, the ratio being 1.85, 1.46 and 1.34 respectively. As noted earlier, this was the area that produced the largest number of disownments for involvement in slavery. As we move inland, the ratios drop to .55 at Contentnea, .51 at Rich Square. Core Sound, on the coast but further south, violated this pattern and had one of the lowest ratios in the table, while the figure for Neuse is so small as not to be significant. Besides, Neuse was established after the great flood of migration had ebbed. Taking the Tidelands and Coastal Plain area as a whole, disownments and migration were almost equal, with a ratio of .92.

In the Piedmont, the situation is entirely different; here migration was much more significant as a cause of membership loss, especially in such meetings as Union, .16, Spring, .19, New Garden, .22, Center and Marlboro,

.25. The highest ratio in this region was Dover, .75, but even this was less than half the combined ratio of Perquimans, Pasquotank and Suttons Creek, which was 1.58. The ratio for the entire Piedmont area was .31; in this region, more than three times as many Friends migrated as were disowned.

The statistics for the western region included those of only two meetings, one of which was discontinued in 1832, and hence are not especially significant. It may be interesting to note that Westfield, the meeting that was closed in the middle of the period under study but was still operating through the time of the heaviest migration, had the larger proportion of disownments to migration. The area as a whole occupied a middle position, with an over-all ratio of .52.

Taking the State as a unit, losses by disownment totalled 4,314, those by migration are estimated at 10,279. Thus, it is seen that while migration was by far the greater cause of membership decline in the Society of Friends, disownment was by no means insignificant.[151]

---

[151] Ibid., 302, 303.

CHAPTER II

THE METHODISTS

The Discipline

Social control through the agency of the Methodist Episcopal Church (the Methodist Episcopal Church, South after 1845) in North Carolina will be dealt with in much the same manner as has been done in relation to the Society of Friends. The foundation of the study will be an examination of the standards of ethical conduct expected of members, followed by an exploration of the Minutes of a representative sample of Quarterly Meeting Conferences to determine the offenses which most frequently demanded disciplinary action.

The history of the Methodist Discipline prior to the opening date of this study is simply and quickly told. Methodism began as a pietistic fellowship within the Church of England. John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, the chief leaders of early Methodism, lived and died as priests of the Anglican Church. Their followers were not members of the Methodist Church but of Methodist societies within the established Church. These societies were governed by the General Rules drawn up by the Wesleys and by regulations adopted by conferences of ministers. These regulations were published in conference minutes from time to time, and finally collected and published as "The Larger Minutes." These rules were followed by the American societies from their beginnings in 1766, and the first Conference in 1773 formally recognized the doctrine and discipline of the English Methodists as its only rule of conduct.[1]

The signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1783, with its recognition of American independence, eliminated any valid reason for the continued domination of American Methodists by their English brethren; religious separation followed logically upon political freedom. Accordingly, Wesley authorized the calling of a General Conference of all American Methodist preachers to meet in Baltimore at Christmas, 1784, for the purpose of organizing his American followers as a separate Church. This Conference, attended by sixty of eighty-three traveling preachers, adopted a *Form of Doctrine and Discipline* which followed substantially the "Larger Minutes" already in use with only such modifications as were necessary to meet local conditions.[2] In May of 1787, the text of the *Discipline* was revised and arranged topically, with some changes in phrasing and content.[3] This document, with changes made from time to time, remained the basis of Methodist discipline throughout the period covered by this study. Topics will be noted in alphabetical order rather than in the random fashion in which they appear in the *Discipline*.

---

[1] Robert Emory, *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: G. Lane and C. B. Tippett, 1845), p. 1. (Hereafter cited as Emory, *History of the Discipline, M. E. Church*).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

ALCOHOL: As early as 1780, Methodists condemned distilling and directed the disownment of members who would not renounce the practice.[4] In 1783, the prohibition was extended to selling and drinking spirituous liquors.[5] When the Discipline was adopted at the formation of the Methodist Church, the clergy were specifically prohibited from drinking distilled liquor except for medicinal purposes.[6] In 1796, a new section dealing with alcohol was added to the Discipline and remained in effect until 1840. This section directed that if any member sold or gave spirituous liquors and as a result any discord took place under his roof, the preacher in charge of the circuit was to proceed against the offender as in any other case of immorality, and the person accused should be "cleared, censored, suspended or exluded" as circumstances demanded.[7] In 1858, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South refused to adopt any further legislation pertaining to the liquor traffic because existing provisions were believed to be adequate.[8] As far back as 1792, the common practice of "treating" at elections received official notice with an advice from the General Conference to all members to refrain from participating in the evil practice in any way.[9] Among actions taken in North Carolina that were in line with this advice was a resolution adopted by the Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Hay Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Fayetteville, July 13, 1829. The members declared that they would not support the election to Congress or the General Assembly of men who were intemperate or who "treated" at election time, and they recommended that all members of the Church follow their example.[10] The Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Iredell Circuit in

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[8] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, General Conference, Journal of the General Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, South (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N. C.), 1858, pp. 385-386.

[9] Emory, *History of the Discipline, M. E. Church*, p. 142.

[10] Elizabeth Lamb, compiler, *Historical Sketch of the Hay Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Fayetteville, North Carolina* (n.p., n.d.), pp. 21, 22. (Hereafter cited as Lamb, *Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville*).

September of the same year pledged themselves not to accept a treat at the hands of any candidate for office and recommended that, other things being equal, Methodists should support only those candidates who entirely abandoned the practice of treating.[11]

A number of circuit Quarterly Meeting Conferences took action in regard to temperance. The resolution of the Iredell Quarterly Meeting Conference referred to above also included a pledge to use influence to "banish the use of distilled spirits except in cases of necessity or when prescribed by a Physician of skile [sic] and probity."[12] In 1833, the Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Guilford Circuit adopted resolutions providing for the establishment of a temperance society. In addition, the members of the Conference pledged themselves not to use ardent spirits, nor to permit their families to use them, except in cases of "extreme necessity." They would not buy, sell nor give liquor away unless prescribed by a "sober and good physician."[13] The Stokes

---

[11] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Virginia Conference, Suffolk [Yadkin?] District, Iredell Quarterly Conference Minutes (Manuscript Division, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C., acquisition number 2930) September 7, 1828. (Cited hereafter as Iredell Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

[12] Ibid., September 7, 1829.

[13] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Western Carolina Conference, Greensboro District, Guilford Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 1832-1865 (Manuscript Department, Duke University, Durham, N.C., acquisition number

Quarterly Meeting Conference pledged that they would "abstain from making, vending or using ardent spirits themselves and to discountenance the use of it by others."[14] The Franklinville Quarterly Meeting Conference "earnestly and affectionately" requested members to desist from distilling ardent spirits and requested the preacher in charge to bring to trial any members who refused.[15]

One problem which caused the North Carolina Conference some difficulty was the interpretation of the clause of the Discipline which required the expulsion of members who distilled ardent spirits, if disorders occurred on the premises. Because distilling itself was not forbidden, and because "disorder" and "premises" were not clearly defined, variations in interpretation and enforcement developed throughout the Conference. To meet this situation, the North Carolina Conference advised that ministers should investigate any charges of distilling or selling

---

3543), June 8, 1833. (Hereafter cited as Guilford Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

[14] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Stokes Circuit, Minute Book, Quarterly Meeting Conference, 1831-1850 (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.) August 28, 1835. (Hereafter cited as Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference Minutes).

[15] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Raleigh District, Chatham Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 1833-1871 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C., acquisition number 2880) July 9, 1858. (Hereafter cited as Chatham Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

spirituous liquors. If no disorder on or in the immediate vicinity of the distillation or sale was found, he was to deal tenderly and affectionately but firmly with the offender in an effort to persuade him to desist from the practice on the ground that it was a bad example and contrary to Christian charity and prudence. If this effort failed, it was to be repeated in the presence of "two or three faithful brethren." Failure in this second effort was to result in the trial of the offender. In case the evidence showed that intemperance or disorder had occurred at the scene of the distilling or sale, or even in its near neighborhood, the offender was to be tried immediately for gross immorality.[16]

An example of Methodist preaching on temperance may be found in a sermon by the Rev. Peter Doub. Mr. Doub discussed the evils of intemperance and found them to include loss of time, expensive feasting and dissipation, inflammation of the human system, a disregard for God and his cause, captivity, slavery, ignorance and want, and finally eternal damnation in hell. As means to prevent the growth of intemperance, he suggested the complete abstinence from the use of spirits as a common drink, refusal to give to any except as a medicine, discouragement of distillation and sale by all possible reasonable means, and concerted actions to enforce these principles.[17]

---

[16] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1840-1848 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C., acquisition number 2726) November 27, 1848. (Hereafter cited as North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1840-1848).

DRESS: Ministers were carefully to avoid all superfluity in their own dress and to speak frequently and faithfully against it in all societies.[18] In addition, they were to give tickets permitting participation in the Lord's Supper to none who wore superfluous ornaments, "high heads, enormous bonnets, ruffles or rings."[19] John Early, Methodist itinerant preacher and later a Bishop, made two references to dress in his diary; once he gave a "plain lecture" on dress because a number of his hearers wore superfluous adornment at the Sacrament,[20] and later he noted that many young people who had never been to a love feast before promised to take off their ruffles, rings and wreathes and never to wear them again if he would admit them to the ceremony. Some peeled off their jewelry at the door as a result of his preaching.[21]

---

[17] William Clark Doub Papers, 1778-1917, Peter Doub Diary (Multilith copy, Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C., 333 items, 4 volumes), pp. 123-124. (Hereafter cited as Peter Doub Diary).

[18] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, p. 21.

[19] Ibid., p. 36.

[20] John Early Diary, May 1807-June 1814 (Typed copy, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. Original in possession of Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.), [November 3, 1812] (Hereafter cited as John Early Diary).

FRIVOLITY: The only reference to frivolity appeared in the General Rules, first outlined by the Wesleys in 1743, which forbad the "taking of such diversions as cannot be used in the name of God."[22] A resolution to prohibit dancing or attendance at circuses and theatres was offered at the General Conference in 1858 but the Committee on Revisals reported that it was unnecessary because the matter was covered in the General Rules.[23] An illustration of Methodist feeling regarding the theatre might be found in the account given by John W. Young, a North Carolina itinerant minister, of a certain woman who had been possessed of the Devil. When a godly minister tried to exorcise the demon, a person standing by asked how Satan could enter into a child of God. At that, Satan replied from within the woman that he had found her in the playhouse, which was his territory, and hence that power over her had been given to him.[24] An editorial in the Holston Messenger, a Methodist periodical circulated in eastern Tennessee and Western North Carolina, commented on the huge profits made by the Park Theatre in New York and then went on to remark that the expense was but a small part of the evils produced by such nurseries of vice, evils which included loss of reputation, damage to health, corruption of morals and the turning of men's minds from their proper occupation.[25] A little later, the same magazine published another article admonishing sincere Christians to avoid plays, balls, public concerts and private dances, because to think such activities harmless was to be spiritually blind. Time was not to be wasted in reading novels, especially those in verse, e.g., "Lord B[yron?].[26] The Rev. Mr. Vaneaton in a sermon at Huntsville condemned the people in the community because they had attended a dancing party connected with the wedding of a certain Captain Long and maintained that the town would never prosper so long as it permitted grog shops and dancing in the vicinity.[27]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 12 [September, 1813].

[22] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, pp. 178-179.

[23] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, General Conference, Journal, pp. 413, 556.

[24] John W. Young Papers, 1784-1965, John W. Young Diary (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.) July 30, 1826. (Hereafter cited as John W. Young Diary).

THE GENERAL RULES, first published by the Wesleys in 1743, were adopted by the early American Societies without change and incorporated with slight modifications in the Discipline in 1789. Among the practices enjoined in the 1743 version were taking the name of the Lord in vain, Sabbath-breaking by doing ordinary work or by buying or selling and selling spirituous liquors or using them except in extreme emergencies. Other actions that were mentioned were fighting, going to law against fellow members, seeking revenge, "the use of many words in buying or selling," taking or giving unlawful interest and dealing in contraband goods. More personal activities that were banned included speaking evil of magistrates or ministers, wearing gold ornaments or costly dress, indulging in diversions which could not be used to the glory of God, singing songs or reading books which did not tend to the knowledge or love of God, indulging one's self needlessly, piling up earthly treasures and making business deals without reasonable expectation of payment.[28] In 1789, drunkenness and drinking spirituous liquors were added to the list; in 1790, this was eased by the inclusion of the phrase "except in cases of necessity." Involvement in the slave trade was forbidden by the General Conference of 1789.[29] Largely the same provisions were included in the "Directions to Band Societies" in 1744 and incorporated in the *Discipline* in

---

[25] Holston Messenger, III (July 1828), 173.

[26] Ibid., IV (November 1829), 343, 344.

[27] Letter, Harriet A. Jarrett to her son, October 5, 1852, The Jarrett-Puryear Papers (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.).

---

[28] Emory, *History of the Discipline, M. E. Church*, pp. 178, 179.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

1791. In particular, drinking alcoholic liquors was forbidden, as was pawning any possession even to save life.[30]

INSOLVENCY: In the *Discipline* adopted in 1784, provision was made for attention to members who became bankrupt. The minister was to confer with the individual concerned, and if he had not kept good business records or had been involved in counterfeiting currency, he was to be expelled immediately.[31] In the revision of 1789, this provision was altered to apply to members who failed in business or who contracted debts which they could not pay. Under these circumstances the elder or deacon was to designate two or three wise members of the society who should inspect the accounts of the suspected delinquent, and if they found that he had behaved dishonorably, or had borrowed without a reasonable expectation of repayment, he was to be suspended until his credit had been restored.[32] In 1796, a provision was added to the section on responsiblities of those in charge of circuits; ministers were to insure that strenuous action was taken in all cases of fraud, and to permit no such persons to remain in membership.[33]

---

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 142, 143.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

MARRIAGE: The provisions regarding marriage adopted by the Conference of 1784 are strongly reminiscent of the requirements of the Discipline of Friends. Marriage to "unawakened persons" was condemened as an evil which resulted in the member either bearing a cross for life of slipping into perdition. Preachers were to enforce publicly the apostolic injunction against unequal marriage with unbelievers. They were openly to declare that any who did so marry would be expelled, and they were to exhort all members not to marry without taking counsel from the most serious-minded persons of the society. Women were normally not to marry without parental consent, but this was to be waived in cases of "necessity" or when parents refused their consent for a girl to marry a member. Even then, a Methodist minister should not perform the cermony.[34] In 1792, the word "unawakened person" was interpreted to mean a person who could not in good conscience be admitted to a Methodist society. Four years later, the prohibition was further interpreted to permit marriage to a person who "had the form but was seeking the power of godliness," but if the marriage partner did not meet the terms of that description in time by joining a Methodist society, the member was to be expelled. In any event, such a marriage was to result in the member being placed in a probationary status. In 1800, the definition of "unawakened person" was deleted and the threatened expulsion of a member was altered to an expression of a determination to discourage marriage to persons not in membership. In 1836, the provision for expelling a person who married outside the society was deleted.[35] Thus there was a gradual but definite weakening of the barriers against marriage outside the society. This was in contrast to the Discipline of the Friends in which there was no relaxation of the accepted standards regarding marriage.

---

[34] Ibid., p. 37.

The Methodists faced a special series of problems in regard to the marriage of their Negro members: Under what conditions should they be permitted to marry? Who should perform the ceremony? Would separation of a married couple through sale of one partner affect the marriage? One solution to these questions is to be found in the records of the Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Trent Circuit. That Conference appointed a committee of four members in 1829 to study the situation and to propose a solution. They reported that they had found their task difficult but necessary, and presented four resolutions: (1) that all slaves who were members of the Circuit and who desired to live together as man and wife should appear before a regularly licensed preacher, either white or colored, and there solemnly promise to take each other as man and wife; (2) that before any such persons were married, the minister should set a time and ask publicly if any persons had sufficient reasons why the couple should not live together, and if no valid objections were advanced, he should pronounce them man and wife "in so far as circumstances will permit"; (3) persons who began to live together as man and wife without compliance with these rules, or who violated them afterwards, should be considered as immoral persons and expelled; and (4) the Secretary of the Conference was to furnish adequate copies of the rules for the instruction of the membership throughout the Circuit.[36]

---

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 188.

NON-PAYMENT OF DEBTS: No specific provisions in regards to non-payment of debts were included in the Discipline until 1812, when a new paragraph was added to "Duties of those in charge of circuits." This addition called for the appointment of a committee of at least three members before whom any debtor was to be called to show cause for his delinquency. The committee was to determine how much further time should be allowed for payment and what security, if any, was to be posted. If the debtor refused, he was to be expelled, but he had the priviledge of appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference. If the creditor felt that he had been mistreated, he also had the right of appeal but in any case the decision of the Quarterly Meeting Conference was final and a member who refused to comply with its ruling was to be expelled.[37]

---

[36] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Virginia and North Carolina Conferences, Newbern and Neuse Districts, New River, Newport and Trent Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 1815-1844 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.) December 26, 1829. (Cited hereafter as Trent Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

QUARRELS AND DISPUTES: The Methodist Episcopal Discipline took account of quarrels and disputes as early as 1781 by providing that the preacher should consult at the Quarterly Meeting Conference with the steward in appointing a committee to investigate the circumstances of any such situation and if there were any suspicion of injustice in their verdict or if they were unable to effect reconciliation, a new committee of more skillful men was to be chosen. If the second committee also failed, the parties were to be expelled from the society.[38] The Christmas Conference at Baltimore in 1784 adopted the same procedure except that the appointment of a second committee was dependent upon the appearance of some fraud or gross error in the original decision. Persons who refused to comply with the decision of the referees were to be expelled.[39] When the Discipline was revised in 1789, the provision for arbitration was somewhat more detailed. Each party was to choose one arbitrator and these two were to select a third, all three of them to be members of the society. The decision of any two of them was to be final, and the refusal of either party to accept it was to result in immediate expulsion. Entry into a suit at law with another member without first seeking arbitration was also to be a cause for expulsion.[40] Appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference was authorized again in 1796, in which case each party chose two arbiters who selected a fifth, with a majority decision to be final. Expulsion from the society was the penalty for refusal to abide by the decision of the arbiters.[41] Again, a similarity with Quaker practice is noted, except that there is no provision for an equivalent of the overseer's personal counselling before formal arbitration machinery was set in motion. Another difference was that the Friends' program could be initiated quickly at the level of the preparative meeting while in the case of the Methodists action was taken more slowly and at the level of the Quarterly Meeting Conference.

---

[37] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, p. 143.

[38] Ibid., pp. 17, 18.

---

[39] Ibid., pp. 58, 59.

[40] Ibid., p. 141.

[41] Ibid., p. 142.

A special problem in connection with quarrels had to do with the custom of dueling. The Hay Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Fayetteville dealt with this situation by unanimously adopting a resolution on March 24, 1838 which condemned the practice, especially among high government officials, and members pledged themselves not to support nor aid in the election of any candidate who favored dueling.[42]

SABBATH-BREAKING: Reference to keeping the Sabbath was confined to a single injunction in the General Rules.[43] However, the matter did receive attention in resolutions adopted by various conferences. The General Conference in 1844 urged all preachers and members to use their best efforts to promote proper observance of the Sabbath through cooperation with associations founded for that purpose. Further, preachers were urged to bring the matter to the attention of their congregations through frequent sermons lest religion and morality should cease to exert their saving influences.[44] The Quarterly Meeting Conference of Caswell Circuit adopted a resolution condemning ordinary work, traveling, and visiting for pleasure on the Sabbath as contrary to both Scripture and the Discipline. The Conference called upon the preacher in charge of the Circuit to bring the subject before the churches in any manner he might deem best.[45] The North Carolina Conference called for more diligent effort in public and in private to bring the membership to a better observance of the Sabbath, and directed that a member of the Conference be appointed to deliver a sermon on the subject at the next meeting.[46]

---

[42] Lamb, Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville, p. 31.

[43] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, p. 178.

[44] Methodist Episcopal Church, General Conference, Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1830-1844 (New York: G. Lane and C. B. Tippett, 1844), p. 130.

SLAVERY: Early Methodist leaders were strong in their opposition to slavery. William Lee Grissom, a Methodist historian, quotes John Wesley as denying that slavery could be consistent with natural justice and affirming that freedom was the right of every human being and that no human law could deprive him of it.[47] To Dr. Thomas Coke, appointed by John Wesley to share with Francis Asbury the Superintendency of American

---

[45] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Greensboro District, Caswell Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 1844-1876 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.) August 15, 1846, (Hereafter cited as Caswell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

[46] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina, Conference, Journal, 1838-1849 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.) November 20, 1849. (Cited hereafter as North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1838-1849).

[47] William Lee Grissom, History of Methodism in North Carolina from 1772 to the Present Time (Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905), I, 227.

Methodists, slavery was a life sentence to toil without compensation beyond mere subsistence, and to ignorance and degradation with little light from religion and none from education.[48]

The earliest position regarding slavery taken by American Methodists came in 1780, when a general conference of ministers declared that the institution was contrary to the laws of God, man and nature and advised all members to free their slaves. In particular, traveling preachers were to promise to set their slaves free.[49] In 1783, local preachers owning slaves in states where laws permitted emancipation were to be given another year in which to free them. In the meantime, itinerants were to deal plainly with the local preachers on the subject and to report their progress at the next General Conference.[50]

The Baltimore Conference of 1784, which organized the Methodist Episcopal Church, dealt with slavery in four actions. Members who bought or sold slaves, except for the purpose of freeing them, were to be expelled, provided they had been informed of the position of the Church regarding slavery. Local preachers who held slaves in Virginia were to be given another year in which to dispose of them, but in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey ministers were to be suspended immediately if they still held slaves.[51] Traveling preachers who were, or who became, slaveholders were not to be employed in the future.[52] The longest and most drastic provisions regarding slavery set up a definite time-table for the emancipation of all slaves owned by members of the Church in such states as legally permitted the step. Preachers were to announce the program to their congregations immediately, after which twelve months were allowed for its accomplishment. In general, all slaves except those under twenty years of age were to be freed within five years. Ministers were to keep complete records of all instruments of emancipation in a Journal. As these rules concerning slavery constituted a new condition for communion, members who did not desire to comply might withdraw peaceably from membership; if they failed to do so, they were to be expelled at the end of the year. No new members were to be admitted until they had complied with the new rules. Members in Virginia were given two years instead of one in which to effect emancipation. Slave traders were to be expelled immediately, except in case of purchase for the purpose of emancipation.[53]

---

[48] Leroy M. Lee, The Life and Times of Jesse Lee (Charleston, S.C.: Published by John Early for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1848), p. 169. (hereafter cited as Lee, Life of Jesse Lee).

[49] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, pp. 14, 15.

[50] Ibid., p. 19.

---

[51] _Ibid._, p. 21.

[52] _Ibid._, p. 22.

The Rev. Jesse Lee, a North Carolina itinerant preacher who later became Chaplain to the United States Senate, expressed an opposition to the 1784 rules which was probably typical of much reaction within the State. He insisted that continual pressing for emancipation would promote the criticism that Methodists were interfering with private property rights and that it would hinder the cause of emancipation, thus prejudicing the interests of the slaves. Secondly, he observed that the issue of emancipation was causing strife and discord within the Church and thus was endangering the religious interests of the membership. Accordingly, he advocated a course of action less drastic and more conciliatory.[54]

The advice of Lee was followed, and the entire 1784 program was suspended the following year, pending further discussion and action at a later Conference.[55]

A much more limited program in relation to slavery was adopted in 1796. At that time, the General Conference expressed its concern over the continued existence of the evil of slavery in the country and advised all subordinate conferences to be very cautious in the admission of men to official position in the Church; in particular, Conferences were to require security from slave-holders to insure that they freed their slaves as rapidly as state law and circumstances would permit. Annual Conferences were given authority to adopt such further regulations regarding slavery as they deemed wise. No slave-holder was to be admitted to membership until he had been counseled by the circuit pastor on the subject of slavery. Members who sold slaves were to be expelled immediately. If a member bought a slave, the next Quarterly Meeting Conference was to determine the period of time in which the newly-acquired slave could work out the price of his purchase; at the expiration of that time, the purchaser was to execute an appropriate instrument of emancipation. Failure or default in any way in the process was punishable by expulsion. Children born to such a slave were to be freed at the age of twenty-one in the case of females, twenty-five for males, or earlier, if the owner so desired.[56]

---

[53] _Ibid._, pp. 43, 44.

[54] Lee, _Life of Jesse Lee_, p. 170.

[55] Emory, _History of the Discipline_, _M. E. Church_, pp. 274, 5.

In 1800, any preacher who became a slave-owner by any means, was to forfeit his ministerial status unless he signed an instrument of manumission, if such action were legal and practicable. Annual conferences were directed to submit addresses to state legislatures calling for gradual emancipation laws in those states which did not have them. All the clergy were to make every effort to secure as many signatures to such petitions as possible, and to keep the process in operation until the desired laws were passed.[57]

---

[56] _Ibid._, pp. 275, 276.

Charles Baumer Swaney maintains that the rules of 1796 were disregarded so widely that they were worthless. Three different proposals were submitted to the General Conference of 1800, all of them tending towards the eventual elimination of slavery from the Methodist fellowship. All of them were rejected. This fact, coupled with the provision that clergy were to free their newly-acquired slaves if it were "legal and practicable" induced Swaney to reach the conclusion that the Methodist Church had no intention of abolishing slavery among those members who desired to continue the practice and that no real opposition to state laws permitting slavery was intended.[58]

In 1804, the rule of 1796 was further weakened. Slaves might be kept in bondage if "mercy and humanity" so indicated. Members in North and South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee were specifically exempted from the operation of the rule on slavery. The provision for annual petitions for emancipation laws was deleted, and in its place a clause was inserted which directed preachers to admonish and exhort slaves to render "due respect and obedience to the commands and interests of their respective masters."[59] At the next General Conference, 1808, all reference to slave-holding by private members was deleted and annual conferences were authorized to form such regulations regarding the buying and selling of slaves as they saw fit. The provisions of the 1804 Discipline calling for ministers to exhort slaves to obedience were also deleted.[60]

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 276, 277.

[58] Charles Baumer Swaney, Episcopal Methodism and Slavery (Boston: Richard G. Badger, the Gorham Press, 1926), p. 41.

In 1816, the opening paragraph of the 1796 rule (see above) was altered to remove any slave-holder from eligibility to any official station in the Church if the laws of his state permitted emancipation and also allowed the freed slave to remain in the state and retain his freedom.[61] Subsequent changes were relatively minor. In 1820, the authority of annual conferences to adopt regulations regarding slave trading was deleted. In 1824, preachers were directed to encourage religious instruction for slaves and permission for them to attend worship "on our regular days of divine service." Colored preachers were to have full privileges in district and quarterly conferences when local custom did not forbid it. Separate district conferences might be set up for colored local preachers where their numbers justified it.[62]

---

[59] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, pp. 227, 8.

[60] Ibid., p. 278.

[61] Ibid., p. 278.

In 1840, the General Conference resolved without a dissenting vote that mere ownership of property in slaves in states which did not permit emancipated slaves to enjoy freedom did not constitute any legal barrier to election or ordination to any office in the Church and hence could not be considered to be grounds for forfeiture of office by any already selected and ordained.[63]

The provisions of the Discipline noted above reveal a rather definite pattern. A program for the rapid elimination of slavery within the membership of the Church was adopted in 1784, promptly shelved the following year and no new action was taken for eleven years when the relatively mild program of 1796 was adopted. Succeeding General Conferences made alterations in that program, all of them in the direction of easing its impact in the slave-holding states. It is understandable, therefore, that in the disciplinary experience of the Methodists comparatively few cases in the area of slavery will be found.

---

[62] _Ibid._, pp. 278, 279.

[63] H. B. Bascom, _Methodism and Slavery: with Other Matters in Controversy between the North and the South, Being a Review of the Manifesto of the Majority in Reply to the Protest of the Minority of the Late General Conference of the Methodist E. Church in the Case of Bishop Andrew_ (Frankfort, Ky.: Hodges, Todd & Pruett, 1845), p. 41.

The provisions of the Discipline relating to the trial of clergy and laymen were primarily concerned with administrative detail of procedure and hence are largely outside the scope of this study. The most significant was the provision that members should be tried before the society of which they were members, or by a committee of it, in the presence of a bishop, elder, deacon or preacher. A member convicted of a breach of good order or of the *Discipline* but not of a crime which would exclude the offender "from the kingdom of grace and glory" had the privilege of appeal to the quarterly meeting conference, where decision was final.[64]

When the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was organized in 1845, it adopted the old *Discipline* without change. No significant alterations were made during the period covered by this study.[65]

The Disciplinary Experience

Two basic difficulties handicap any effective study of the enforcement of discipline in the Methodist Episcopal Church during the period covered by this study; lack of sufficient records, and the inadequacy of those which are available. In the first place, the records of many Methodist Circuits are not available, so that a sampling rather than an exhaustive study is all that is possible. A more serious problem arises from the method of enforcement used in the Methodist Church. It will be recalled that, especially in the case of laymen, trial for violations of the Discipline was held at the level of the local congregation, in the class meeting (a sub-division of the congregation) or by an ad hoc committee. Virtually none of these maintained records which have been preserved. Almost all the records available for study are those of the Quarterly Meeting Conference, composed of the local preachers, the stewards and the class leaders from all the congregations of the circuit, and normally presided over by the presiding elder of the district. However, this conference had essentially appelate jurisdiction, except in the case of charges against a minister. Appeal was open to the accused if he were convicted, or to the local preacher if he felt that an acquittal had produced a serious miscarriage of justice. Accordingly, the records of the Quarterly Meeting Conference represent only a minor fraction of the members who were tried and expelled.

---

[64] Emory, *History of the Discipline, M. E. Church*, pp. 189, 190.

[65] P. A. Peterson, *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1888), *passim*.

Of the Quarterly Meeting Conference records which were studied, those of the Grace Methodist Episcopal

Church of Wilmington[66] included sufficient data on church membership and expulsions to make them significant.

TABLE 3

Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Wilmington

	Church Membership			Expulsions		
	Whites	Colored	Total	White	Colored	Total
1832	90	475	565	2	40	42
1833	91	476	567	1	27	28
1834	112	539	651	5	18	23
1835	148	529	677	0	17	17
1836	132	552	684	9	15	24
1837	144	498	642	2	14	16
1838	231	582	813	0	7	7
1839	207	590	797	9	20	29
1840	201	592	793	4	19	23
1841	186	633	819	6	12	18
1842	202	633	835	2	22	24
1843	Figures not available			0	3	3
1844	Figures not available			0	14	14
1845	Figures not available			0	5	5
1846	200	790	990	5	25	30
1847	252	792	1044	1	61	62
1848	269	834	1103	1	13	14
1849	283	749	1032	1	17	18
1850	281	719	1000	0	10	10
1851	296	815	1111	0	20	20
1852	390	1015	1405	1	10	11

From these figures it may be computed that for the period 1832-1843, expulsions of white members averaged 2.2% per year, while those for colored members averaged 3.6% per year. For the later period for which full figures are available, 1846-1852, the discrepency between the expulsion rate for white and colored members was even more drastic, .6% per year for whites, 2.7% per year for colored members. Except for 1846, expulsion of white members almost ceased to exist in the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilmington while the expulsion of colored members declined but not markedly. Although causes for expulsion were not indicated in the Grace Church records, the sharp variance in expulsion rates between whites and colored members suggests that church discipline was utilized as a means for maintaining control over the slave population.

---

[66] Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Wilmington, N.C., (Front Street Church), Quarterly Reports, 1810-1852 and Church Records, 1832-1852 (Microfilms, North Carolina Department of History and Archives, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.) passim. (Hereafter cited as Grace M. E. Church, Wilmington, Quarterly Reports).

The next phase of this study is an examination of disciplinary cases as reported in minutes of Quarterly Meeting Conferences, the North Carolina Annual Conference and the diaries of ministers. As remarked at the beginning of this section, data is available on a limited number of circuits and apply primarily to appeals and clergy, but the number is sufficiently large a sample to reflect the types of offenses encountered and to indicate a little of their relative frequency.

For example, the Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Lincolnton Circuit recalled the license to preach of David Brindles on the Ground that he professed to be a conjuror.[67] The Journal of the North Carolina Conference contains the records of two cases involving dishonesty on the part of clergy. In 1840, "Bro. Hendricks" was charged with dishonesty in connection with funds raised for Randolph-Macon College. His appointment to a circuit for the ensuing year was held up pending investigation by the presiding elder of the Washington District. Hendricks made acknowledgement of his fault, offered a "satisfactory explanation and pledged himself to make restitution at an early date. Accordingly, his credentials were restored and he received an appointment for the following year.[68] Financial difficulties also involved Thomas W. Postall in serious difficulty. He was charged with four counts of borrowing money and either failing to make repayment or making false statements regarding payment, and one count of keeping a horse against the wish of its owner. He was found guilty on all counts and expelled from the Church.[69]

---

[67] Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Shelby District, Lincolnton and Rocky Springs Circuit Quarterly Conference, Minutes, 1828-1876 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.), 7 August, 1831. (Hereafter cited as Lincolnton Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes).

[68] North Carolina Conference, Minutes, 1840-1848, pp.35, 40, 71, 82.

[69] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1846-1866 (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.) 20 November, 1855, pp. 192, 193.

Distillation of spirituous liquors does not appear as a cause of expulstion as frequently as might be expected. Elam Gaither of Iredell Circuit was tried by a committee of his own class on a charge of distilling. The case was referred to the Quarterly Meeting Conference which laid the matter on the table until after the next Annual Conference. The Minutes do not include the final disposition of the case.[70] It was apparently in response to the request of the Iredell Circuit for guidance that the Annual Conference took the action referred to earlier when it instructed preachers to investigate all reported cases of distillation or vending of spirits among members, admonishing them when spirits were found but no disorder and expelling them where there was disorder.[71] Adolphus Magnum later pastor of the Methodist Church in Chapel Hill, noted in his diary that the class leader at Gravel Hill in Alamance County was engaged in making brandy. Magnum reported that many in the Church were vexed with him on that account, and indicated his own belief that this feeling was responsible for the coldness he found in the Church.[72]

---

[70] Iredell Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 13 November, 1847, 8 April, 1848.

[71] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1846-1866, 28 November, 1848, pp. 33, 34.

[72] Magnum Papers, Adolphus W. Mangum Diary (manuscript, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.), 13 October, 1855. (Hereafter cited as Mangum, Diary).

If distilling produced few cases, its product was responsible for a somewhat more substantial total. As early as 1812, John Early reported expelling a member for drinking.[73] John W. Young, an itinerant who spent most of his long ministry in Person and Franklin counties, tells of a member being suspended for a time at Plank Chapel for drinking "spiritual liquor."[74] Reuben Ellis, a local preacher of Iredell Circuit, was charged with intoxication along with other offenses which will be noted later. He was tried by a committee of four local preachers which suspended him from his preaching activities until the succeeding Quarterly Meeting Conference. The charges and notes of the testimony given before the committee were then read and additional evidence was introduced. The Conference found him guilty on four counts of intoxication and expelled him. Two members of the Conference were appointed to secure his license to preach for the purpose of returning it to the Annual Conference which had issued it.[75] Three years later, in 1829, Hiram Rather appealed his conviction for intemperance to the Iredell Quarterly Meeting Conference. He failed to appear in defense of his appeal, and his conviction was confirmed.[76]

---

[73] John Early, Diary, 6 [September, 1812].

[74] John W. Young, Diary, 13 May, 1819.

[75] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 3rd Quarterly Meeting, 1826.

Trent Circuit had a case concerning Benjamin Mason, a local preacher belonging to the Adams Church. He was tried by a committee on a charge of drunkenness, found guilty and suspended pending appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference. The chief evidence against him was a certificate by Thomas B. Wallace alleging that the accused had, the previous summer, been in such a condition that he vomited and could not get out of a boat or attend to business. In defense, A. Hatch testified that he had been in company with Mason on a trip to Alabama that lasted over three weeks, that he had seen him take a second drink but once, and that he had always behaved as a Christian gentleman. Mason did not appear at the committee hearing, but sent word by a "brother Bass" that he did not recall the incident about the boat and did not believe himself to be guilty. The Quarterly Meeting Conference reversed the decision of the committee and restored Mason's license to preach.[77] The same year, 1833, Caleb Anderson, a layman of the class at Hanover, was tried and acquitted on a charge of intoxication. The case was appealed to the Quarterly Meeting Conference by R. G. Bass, the local preacher. Again, the decision of the committee was reversed and Anderson was expelled. In this case, the evidence against the accused was strengthened by testimony that he seldom attended class meeting or public worship, although he lived little more than three miles from the meeting-house.[78]

---

[76] Ibid., 25 April, 1829.

[77] Trent Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 20 July, 1833.

The case of John F. Price, a member of Childers Church on the Lincolnton Circuit who had been acquitted by the local Society on a charge of intoxication, was sent back for a new trial.[79] In this instance, the pastor had appealed an acquittal. No mention was made of the final disposition of the case.

Elizabeth Chaffin of the Doub Church in the Stokes Circuit was tried and convicted on a charge of intoxication and expelled.[80] Thomas L. Allen, a local preacher of the same Circuit, was accused of drunkenness and assorted other crimes. He was notified to appear before the Quarterly Meeting Conference; instead he sent a letter substantially admitting the truth of the charge and enclosed his license to preach, thus surrendering his position as a local preacher. He was expelled from the Church.[81]

---

[78] Ibid., 4 January, 1834.

[79] Lincolnton Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 16 May, 1846.

[80] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 20 May, 1848.

Possibly the most important trial on a charge of intoxication was that of the Rev. Samuel S. Bryant, a trustee of Greensboro Female College and frequently the Clerk of the North Carolina Conference. Bryant had been tried and convicted by a committee of clergy from the Newbern District to which he belonged, and was suspended pending the meeting of the Annual Conference of 1848. The trial lasted from the morning of November 27 through the afternoon of December 1. The hearing was open to the public, with the balcony of the Church reserved for spectators. The testimony which had been presented to the Committee was introduced to the Conference, and a total of fifteen witnesses were examined. Probably the most damaging evidence against Bryant was his own acknowledgement that he had deliberately set out to get drunk in the city of Richmond. His closing argument in his own behalf lasted several hours, but it was to no avail; he was convicted and sentenced to loss of all authority to perform ministerial functions within the Church.[82] At the Conference of 1849, a petition was presented by the Pittsylvania Circuit requesting that his credentials be restored to him. This petition was refused, but the Conference did adopt a resolution acknowledging that the Rev. Mr. Bryant had "given gratifying evidence of a walk and conversation becoming a Christian minister since his last connection with the Church," and indicating that if he continued to do well, the Conference would be happy to restore him at a proper future time.[83] The following year, 1850, his credentials were restored,[84] and his name appears a number of times in the Journal as a member of various committees. His final trouble came in 1857, when he was tried on charges of falsehood, deception and fraud, was convicted and expelled from the Church.[85]

---

[81] *Ibid.*, 13 May, 1854.

[82] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1840-1848, 22 November-1 December, 1848, *passim*.

In the area of falsehood, mention has already been made of S. S. Bryant and of Reuben Ellis of Iredell Circuit who was convicted on four counts of intoxication but was acquitted on a charge of false swearing.[86] In the same Circuit, Winston Mays, a member of the Chestnut Grove Church, was charged in 1857 with falsehood by John B. Boyd. He was tried by the local society and acquitted, but the preacher in charge appealed the case to the

---

[83] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1846-1866, 4 December, 1849, p. 52.

[84] *Ibid.*, 20 December, 1850.

[85] *Ibid.*, 18 September, 1857.

[86] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 3rd. Quarterly Conference, 1826.

Quarterly Meeting Conference. Here Mays was found guilty on one specification, acquitted on another. He was placed on probation for six months.[87] The same Circuit had another case involving falsehood in 1841. This time Joseph White appealed a conviction and sentence of expulsion. The key evidence was from David Scroggs who gave testimony that he offered to trade horses with White, and that White had informed him that his horse was five years old. A conflicting statement was given by R. S. Tays, who claimed that White had told him the horse in question was six years old. The ruling of the Society was confirmed and White was expelled.[88]

In the Chatham Circuit, charges were brought against the Rev. Alfred Caveness for telling John Parks that he could not sell him some wheat for less than $1.15 per bushel because he had taken it as payment on a debt at $1.25, when he actually had bought it from a third party for $1.00. After extended discussion, the Conference voted to sustain the charge but to confine punishment to twelve months suspension because of the possibility of misunderstanding on the part of one of the witnesses as to what Caveness had actually said.[89] In

---

[87] Ibid., 11 September, 1837.

[88] Ibid., 18 September, 1841.

[89] Chatham Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 27 July, 1858.

1859, when he was a local preacher on the Franklinsville Circuit, he was tried again on charges of falsehood and fraud, convicted and expelled from the Church. He appealed to the North Carolina Conference, which reversed the verdict.[90]

Closely connected with these cases of falsehood were several for fraud. John Early mentions the expulsion of an old local preacher who was expelled on this charge in the Bedford Quarterly Meeting Conference 5 June, 1813.[91] Hays Street Church at Fayetteville seemed to have been somewhat plagued with this same problem. In 1819, John Robson was charged with fraud on the ground that he knew that the firm of Pearce and Robson was facing bankruptcy and had transferred a house and lot to C. H. Johnson, his brother-in-law, to the injury of his creditors. At the same time, Johnson was charged with accepting the property and with giving Robson an ante-dated receipt for it. Both were found guilty and expelled.[92] In the same church, Joshua E. Lumsden was convicted of appropriating goods purchased from distant dealers to pay local accounts and of lying to the sheriff.

---

[90] North Carolina Conference, Journal 1846-1866, 21 December, 1859, p. 315.

[91] John Early Diary 5 [June, 1813].

[92] Lamb, Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville, p. 17.

He appealed to the Quarterly Meeting Conference but lost.[93]

At the Lincolnton Circuit, a certain Mr. King brought an action against Mr. Abernathy for "fraud in packing cotton." [Too many sticks and stones in the cotton?] He was convicted at his original hearing but this verdict was unanimously reversed by a committee of the Quarterly Meeting Conference.[94]

Under the general heading of frivolity, a number of types of cases will be noted. It will be remembered that among the offenses for which Thomas L. Allen was expelled from the Iredell Circuit was gambling.[95] Abram Jones Cox tells of the custom of John Bowman, pastor of the Newbern Circuit in 1837, who brought to trial and expelled all dancers unless they showed positive signs of reformation.[96] The 1856 session of the North Carolina Conference received the acknowledgement of George W. Fanabee that he had attended a circus during the past year, and accordingly disapproved his conduct, but "in view of his confession, penitence and promise of amendment," his character was passed and no punitive action was taken against him.[97]

---

[93] Ibid., pp. 18, 19.

[94] Lincolnton Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 30 November, 1844.

[95] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 13 May, 1854.

[96] Abram Jones Cox "Opposition of the Methodist Circuit Riders to Prevelent American Vices" (Unpublished

In the administration of church discipline among the Methodists, the term "immorality" did not always have a sexual connotation as it frequently was used in a general sense; in most of the following cases, however, it did have a sexual implication. At times, a surprising amount of leniency was displayed in the handling of this type of incident. For instance, in 1845, the Rev. Mr. B. Corn was found guilty by the Annual Conference on a charge of "unchastity and immorality" but the Conference believed that there were "extenuating circumstances" in the case and it sentenced him merely to a twelve-month suspension from the ministry on the understanding and on his pledge that at the end of that time he would "retire into the ranks of the laity."[98] Again, Wesley L. Pegues was convicted by the Annual Conference of 1851 of immoral conduct, but because of his repentence and belief that he had been forgiven, and because of evidence that he would be accepted as a minister where he was best known, he was publicly reproved by the Conference

---

B. D. Thesis, Duke University School of Religion, Durham, N.C., 1937), p. 105.

[97] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1846-1866 14 November, 1856, p. 216.

[98] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1840-1848, 3 December, 1845.

and his credentials were then restored.[99] The Conference was not always so long-suffering. Absolom Owen, a preacher of the Newbern Circuit, was charged with taking improper liberties with certain married ladies living in his circuit. After a full investigation, the Conference confirmed the findings of the Committee appointed in the case and expelled Owen.[100] George W. Heptinstall, a deacon, was expelled on a charge of "improper and indelicate conduct" to which he had pleaded guilty.[101]

Among the laity, Jack Hill and Luisy Hatridge appealed a conviction for adultery to the Quarterly Meeting Conference of Grace Church in Wilmington, but the verdict of expulsion stood.[102] A negro member of the same Church, one Toney Bradley, was acquitted of a charge of adultery by the colored Leader of his Class. The preacher in charge of the Circuit brought the case up to the Quarterly Meeting Conference, where the decision of the Leader was reversed.[103] The handling of this case is illustrative of the responsibility which the Wilmington Church placed upon its

---

[99] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1846-1866, 26 November, 1851, p. 78.

[100] Ibid., 30 November, 1849, p. 46.

[101] Ibid., 16 December, 1859.

[102] Grace M. E. Church, Wilmington, Quarterly Reports, 16 August, 1834.

[103] Ibid., 8 August, 1842.

Negro leadership.

An illustration of the efforts that were made to insure that a fair trial was given is to be found in the case of Emsley Woodburn of the Wesleyan Chapel of the Guilford Circuit. He had been expelled on charges of immorality, but appealed to the Quarterly Meeting Conference on the ground that he had not been informed of the charges placed against him, nor of the time and place of the trial. His appeal was accepted and he was given a new trial.[104] A similar situation arose in the case of J. L. Moore, a local preacher of the Stokes Circuit, who had been tried by a committee on a charge of immoral conduct. When the committee reported to the Quarterly Meeting Conference that they had heard the evidence both for an against Moore and that they found the charges to be fully substantiated, he requested time to obtain further testimony. His request was granted, and the Conference adjourned until the middle of the afternoon. When the Conference re-assembled, Moore declined to produce any additional testimony, the decision of the Committee was confirmed and his license to preach was not renewed.[105] No mention was made of expulsion from the Church or any other punitive action except the withdrawal of his license.

---

[104] Chatham Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 10 September, 1832.

[105] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 21 August, 1843.

Jeremiah Norman mentions in his Diary two instances of expulsion for immorality, in one of which he broadly suggests a sexual connotation but not in the other.[106]

Mention has already been made of the efforts that were made to insure that the accused member was properly protected in his trial. There were a number of ministers who were disciplined for mal-administration in the enforcement of church discipline. J. G. Bodenheimer expressed an intention of charging I. W. Lewis, secretary of the Iredell Quarterly Meeting Conference with mal-administration. The charge was laid before the Annual Conference, but Lewis was not informed of that fact personally. As this omission would handicap Lewis in preparing his defense, the Quarterly Meeting refused to pass the character of Bodenheimer; such action would normally result in the loss of a license to preach.[107] W. D. McMasters was charged with destroying class records in his Circuit and thus affecting adversely the interests of the membership. The charge was sustained but his character was passed and he received an assignment for

---

[106] Jeremiah Norman, Diary, XVIII, 1000 and XIII, 773. [N.B.: there is an error in pagination in the source at this point, as pp. 773 and 774 are repeated].

[107] Stockes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 21 August, 1843.

for the year.[108] The Rev. S. S. Bryant, whom we have met before, was charged with mal-administration on three counts regarding the trial of William Weatherhead of the Caswell Circuit; debarring circumstantial evidence from the trial, changing the specification to the charge and placing Weatherhead on probation contrary to the Discipline of the Church. The Annual Conference decided that he was not guilty of mal-administration,[109] but the case is illustrative of a concern that trials should be held with a proper consideration for the protection of the accused. On the other hand, Bishop Pierce ruled that a minister presiding at a trial had the right to decide on the competence of witnesses and the admissability of evidence, thus strengthening the position of the clergy in the administration of church discipline.[110]

In sharp contrast to the experience of the Society of Friends, very few cases were found in the areas of marriage and the home. At the Hay Street Church, Fayetteville, Gilbert Eccles brought a charge against John H. Pierce, a steward and local preacher, for taking his daughter Fanny in marriage without his consent. Pierce was convicted and sentenced to suspension from all priviledges of membership for three months; he was to be restored at the end of that time if his conduct in the meantime justified it. Apparently his deportment proved acceptable, for he was re-elected steward and his license to exhort was renewed a few months later and within less than two years he was granted a new license to preach.[111] George Warden, also of Hay Street, Fayetteville, was not quite so fortunate; he was expelled for taking a second wife while his first was still alive. He had to wait for two years before he was restored to his place in the Church.[112] Jeremiah Norman records disowning a member (without identifying her) for marrying an infidel who had been brought up in a Christian atmosphere and who had told Norman that he did not intend to live in sin all his life.[113] John Early put a local preacher on trial for marrying an irreligious woman.[114] A case which one might well wish he could know more about was that of L. C. Doub, who was found not guilty in the whipping of a child.[115]

---

[108] North Carolina Conference, Journal, 1840-1848, p. 23.

[109] _Ibid_., p. 17.

[110] North Carolina Conference Journal, 1846-1866, 20 December, 1859.

Regular attendance at public worship, class meetings and quarterly meeting conferences was expected and willful failure to attend rendered a member liable to suspension or expulsion. There is evidence, however, that the rule was not always rigidly enforced. An example of this may be found in the records of the Stokes Circuit. The main body of most quarterly meeting conferences consists of the answers to a series of questions, one of which was, "Are there any complaints?" At the Conference of 24 March, 1838, seventeen members were criticised because of their neglect of their official duties, including attendance at Conference. At this particular session, only nine members were present out of a membership of twenty-six; obviously, the problem had gotten serious. The preacher in charge was instructed to request the absentees to attend the next session and explain their absence. At the June meeting, twenty-two members were present; eleven of the absentees made satisfactory explanation of their neglect and their characters were approved. Samuel Black was deprived of his office because of his neglect. The cases of four members were carried forward because they were still absent. At the next meeting in September, two men made satisfaction but the case of James Odell was placed in the hands of the preacher for disciplinary action.[116]

---

[111] Lamb, Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville, p. 13.

[112] Ibid., pp. 14, 15.

[113] Jeremiah Norman Diary, XIII, 774.

[114] John Early Diary, 21 [August, 1811].

[115] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 16 October, 1848.

---

[116] Ibid., 24 March, 9 June and 10 September, 1848.

The reluctance of the membership of the Church to take action in cases of neglect of meeting is illustrated by a case that arose in Trent Circuit. William Huggins, a member of the class at Trenton, was warned by the preacher that his continued absence from class meeting would make him liable to expulsion from the Church. Huggins failed to mend his ways, but the class refused to consider his absence as willful, although he had not attended in more than a year. The preacher took the case to the quarterly meeting conference of the circuit, where the charge was sustained and the decision of the class meeting was over-ruled.[117] Sometimes the laity was less lenient in cases of neglect than were the clergy. A case in point is that of David Smith of Lincolnton Circuit. He was tried by his society for neglect of class meeting and was found guilty. He then promised amendment and the preacher, Mr. McGilvary, proposed that they bear with Smith and retain him in membership. The Society refused, and McGilvary appealed his sentence to the Quarterly Meeting Conference, which confirmed the action of the society.[118]

The concept of neglect of duty touched family and personal responsibilities as well as those of the organizational life of the Church. The cases of Joshua Nixon and William Edwards, both of Lincolnton Circuit, charged with neglect of family prayers, were referred to the Quarterly Meeting Conference. Both were convicted and expelled.[119]

---

[117] Trent Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 20 December, 1839.

[118] Lincolnton Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 8 June, 1844.

Sometimes a man's conscience was more bothered by his own neglect than by that of his neighbors; Durant H. Lane of Trent Circuit formally complained of himself for not exhorting as much as he ought and promised to reform.[120]

Action on the grounds of failure to pay honest debts was rather rare. One of the most striking cases came from the Stokes Circuit, where Jesse Melton and John Ross were in a dispute over Melton's failure to pay his pledge of twenty dollars towards the cost of building a new church. Arbiters were appointed to settle the matter and they decided that Melton should pay only fifteen dollars. Melton refused and carried the case to the Quarterly Meeting Conference and asked for a new arbitration, which was granted. The new committee further reduced the amount of the debt to ten dollars, which both parties accepted.[121] This would seem to have ended the matter, but Ross later charged Melton with lying and dishonesty. The Church at Bethany found Melton guilty of the charge, but he took an appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference which sustained the Church and expelled him.[122]

---

[119] Ibid., 24 November, 1838.

[120] Trent Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes , 26 December, 1829.

A case that involved a purely personal debt was that of Risdom Cooper of Hilreath Meeting House in Iredell Circuit. He was expelled by his class meeting but requested the Quarterly Meeting Conference to restore him to membership. In view of the fact that he was a man "sustaining a good moral character" and that he had paid the debt since he had been expelled, his request was granted.[123]

Trials on charges of Sabbath-breaking were not especially common. Hay Street Church at Fayetteville tried Thomas Hearn before a committee for violation of the Sabbath by leaving home with a wagon-load of goods on "business of a temporal nature." He was suspended until the next session of the Quarterly Meeting Conference, where he acknowledged his fault and was restored to membership.[124] Another member of the same Church, a certain "C. T. G.," was found guilty of "unintentional Sabbath breaking" by selling and delivering two turkeys on Sunday. He was reproved and upon acknowledgment of his fault he was forgiven. The preacher in charge of the Circuit took the case to the Quarterly Meeting Conference which upheld the previous decision.[125] John Lloyd of Trent Circuit was charged with grinding grain on the Sabbath. He was convicted by a committee of the society to which he belonged. Believing that an injustice had been done him, he appealed but the Conference upheld the Society.[126]

---

[121] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 8 December, 1838, March, 1839.

[122] _Ibid_., 8 December, 1839.

[123] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 24 January, 1824.

An area of personal conduct which received a considerable amount of attention was that of slander and the making of reckless charges. In the Guilford Circuit, John W. Harris was expelled by a committee on the charge that he had said that the prosecution of a certain Sarah Smith had been malicious. He appealed to the Quarterly Meeting Conference which confirmed the finding of the committee as to his guilt but on his confession reduced his sentence to reproof by the Presiding Elder and a period of probation. At the same meeting, William Adams appealed a conviction for "indulgence in sinful words and tempers and of slandering John W. Harris," the defendent in the preceeding case. The Conference confirmed his conviction for sinful words and tempers but acquitted him of slander. His final sentence was the same as that of Harris, reproof and probation.[127]

---

[124] Lamb, _Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville_, p. 28.

[125] _Ibid._, p. 31.

[126] Trent Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 24 October, 1835.

Christina Saunius of Stokes Circuit was convicted by a committee on a charge of slander, but the preacher in charge believed that justice had not been done to her, so he took the case to the Quarterly Meeting Conference, where a motion to reverse the decision of the committee was defeated.[128] The same Circuit expelled a Brother Spence on a similar charge.[129] At the Lincolnton Circuit, J. Covington was charged with the use of improper language about the Church and the preachers, A committee of two members was appointed to visit him and warn him to refrain from further improper talk. This he promised to do, his character was passed and no further action was taken against him.[130] Jeremiah Norman mentioned two cases of expulsion for improper talk, one of an old man and the other a young woman who had been accused of "false and mischievious talk."[131]

---

[127] Guilford Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 14 October, 1833.

[128] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 24 December, 1842.

[129] Ibid., 20 May, 1842.

[130] Lincolnton Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 9 August, 1852.

An interesting case of theft arose in the Iredell Circuit, when Robert Hall charged Zachariah Jacobs with stealing a hog. The evidence showed that Jacobs had in his possession a hog with the markings used by Hall to identify his stock and that Jacobs had refused to surrender it. Jacobs was found guilty and expelled.[132]

Iredell also expelled a member, one James Lackey of Rocky Springs Church, on a dual charge of profane swearing and lying. He appealed to the Quarterly Meeting Conference which sustained the decision of the Church.[133] Earlier in this study the expulsion of Thomas L. Allen, a local preacher of Stokes Circuit, was mentioned in connection with drunkenness; another of the charges against him was that of swearing.[134]

Hay Street Church in Fayetteville seemed to have something of a problem in the area of quarrels and disputes within the membership of the Church. William James was charged with causing discord within the Church by writing a letter to a Mr. Dunwoody in which he accused a number of members of the Church of being unchristian in character. The letter was read before the Quarterly Meeting Conference, whose members decided that it contained many inconsistencies and that it laid its author subject to censure. James was unanimously placed under suspension for three months, after which time he was to be restored to full membership, if he made no further trouble.[135] James Yates was apparently a center of conflict within the Fayetteville Church. First, he was involved in a quarrel with Noah Parker which resulted in Parker being expelled.[136] Then he brought charges against Sam and Margaret Pearce for going to law against him and for using improper language. The Quarterly Meeting Conference decided that such conduct was unchristian, but on their promise to maintain peace no action was taken against them.[137] Lewis Hatton was suspended by a select committee and then by the Quarterly Conference for being publicly angry with an apprentice boy and striking him.[138]

---

[131] Jeremiah Norman, Diary, XIII, 778 and XVIII, 951.

[132] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 27 April, 1826.

[133] _Ibid_., 20 August, 1832.

[134] Stokes Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 13 May, 1854.

Among other cases throughout the State, J. F. Stevenson and Abner Sharpe of Iredell Circuit got into a quarrel over remarks which Stevenson was charged with making concerning Sharpe's sister Miranda. Each party chose two arbiters, who together selected a fifth. After hearing testimony presented by both sides, the committee decided that Stevenson had merely related an unfavorable report which was current in the community and that if he had changed it, it was to lessen its seriousness. He was accordingly acquitted of slander.[139]

---

[135] Lamb, Hay St. M. E. Church, Fayetteville, p. 15.

[136] Ibid., p. 15.

[137] Ibid., pp. 17, 18.

[138] Ibid., pp. 20, 21.

A "plague on both your houses" verdict was rendered in the Caswell Circuit in a case in which John Westbrook and William P. Chambers had become involved over the failure of Westbrook to fulfill a contract to deliver some shingles in 1843. Both men were expelled.[140]

Diaries of the period also show reflections of the problem of quarreling within the membership. The Diary of Jeremiah Norman contains an account of a lengthy family quarrel within the Shell family. The matter came to the attention of the Church and extended efforts were made by Norman to settle the affair. When the elder Shell and his wife refused to follow the recommendations of a committee appointed by the Society, both of them were expelled. Norman commented that most people felt sorry for Mrs. Shell, but believed that the "old man" deserved all he got.[141]

---

[139] Iredell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 26 August, 1848.

[140] Caswell Circuit Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 27 September 1845, pp. 14, 15.

A local situation is to be found reflected in a letter by Adolphus W. Mangum, written while he was pastor of the Methodist Church in Chapel Hill. He had found a number of the members who were not speaking to each other and had "abused them from the pulpit" until he was tired. If the trouble did not clear up shortly, he wrote, he was about ready to put some of them on trial, for he was determined to have peace in the Church regardless of the cost to himself in terms of friends or salary.[142]

While the number of individual cases is not such as will permit the drawing of definitive conclusions, several observations are possible. The first is that a real effort was made to strike a balance between the enforcement of rigid discipline and the protection of the interests of the accused. This concern was reflected in two ways, the provisions for appeal, and the considerable number of cases in which the verdict of a local hearing was reversed by the Quarterly Meeting Conference. This group represented the official leadership of an entire circuit, which frequently embraced a county and where local prejudices and personal feelings could not play as active a role as they did in a local congregation. In addition, the Annual Conference seemed to be rather ready to forgive a transgression when the delinquent showed repentence and a readiness to mend his ways.

---

[141] Jeremiah Norman, Diary, XIII, 740.

[142] Adolph W. Mangum to his "sister," Chapel Hill, N.C., 21 September, 1849, Mangum Papers.

A second observation is that although the Methodist fellowship punished a wide variety of offenses, none of them were committed with inordinate frequency. In this connection one finds nothing comparable to irregular marriage in the Society of Friends, which produced 82 per cent of the cases in which the cause of disownment was indicated. This fact is especially significant when it is recalled that marriage to a non-Methodist was a valid reason for disciplinary action as late as 1836.[143] Of the cases studied, the largest number was in the general area of personal relationships, such as quarrels, slander and family disputes. Incidents regarding business affairs were not prominent, except perhaps in the town of Fayetteville. The intemperate use of alcohol produced a moderate number of cases, but expulsion because of distillation or sale seldom appeared. The lack of any cases involving slavery can easily be accounted for by the relatively moderate position regarding the institution which the General Conference had adopted by the time this study begins. In 1804, private slave-holders in North Carolina were specifically exempted from the observance of the rules regarding slavery.[144]

---

[143] Emory, History of the Discipline, M. E. Church, pp. 187, 188.

---

[144] *Ibid.*, pp. 276, 277.

CHAPTER III

THE BAPTISTS

Standards of Conduct

The earliest organized Baptist Church in North Carolina was established by Paul Palmer in Perquimans' Precinct on the Chowan River in either 1727 or 1729.[1] Joseph William Parker founded Meherrin Church in 1729, and William Sojourner established Kehukee in 1742. By 1750, sixteen churches, some of them with over two hundred members, had been organized, lying west and south of the Roanoke River.[2]

These Baptist pioneers in North Carolina followed Arminian theology. As disciples of Jacobus Arminius, a Dutch theologian of the sixteenth century, they held to a modified Calvinism. In particular, they believed that the Atonement of Christ applied to all men who would accept it through faith. The followers of Arminius, who were especially strong in England, were known as

---

[1] David Benedict, General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World (Boston: Lincoln, 1813), p. 681. (Hereafter cited as Benedict, General History.)

[2] Ibid., p. 682.

General Baptists. Shortly after the middle of the eighteenth century, most of the General Baptists were converted to Particular Baptists who held to a strict Calvinist doctrine of an Atonement limited in its effectiveness to the predestined few. By 1770, this group had adopted the title of Regular Baptists. A third group, especially important in North Carolina, were the Separates, true sons of George Whitefield and the New England Awakening of the 1740's.

The reformation of the General or Regular Baptist into the Particular variety began shortly after 1750. Particular Baptists had settled in Charleston, South Carolina, as early as 1696. A number of churches were established, and an association was formed which was in correspondence with that of Philadelphia. In 1754 the latter Association sent John Gano on a survey and preaching tour which took him through much of eastern North Carolina. Benjamin Miller and Peter Van Horn made a similar trip at about the same time.[3] Late in 1754 or early in 1755 Miller led a group from New Jersey to the Yadkin Valley, where they established the Jersey Baptist Church. Miller spent most of his time among the General Baptists, seeking to convert them to Particularist views. By 1759, most of the churches had been re-constituted in line with the teachings of Miller.[4]

---

[3] George Washington Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' "Materials toward a History of the Baptists in North Carolina'", North Carolina Review, VII (July 1930), 370. (Hereafter cited as Edwards', Materials.)

The process of re-constitution of a church was quite simple. The key man in the whole matter was the pastor of the church, which frequently met in his home and was closely under his control. When a minister was converted to Particularist views, he simply dissolved the church and examined the members to ensure that they had the necessary "religious experience" to qualify them for church membership. Those who qualified, and who were willing to sign a new Church Covenant, usually less than five per cent of the original membership, were accepted and they elected new church officers. The low percentage of those who accepted the new standards was apparently due to a conservative attitude of the laity towards change and the necessary acceptance of a strict Calvinist theology. Several things were involved in this reformation. For one thing, emphasis was placed upon regeneration and a changed life rather than upon Baptism. Secondly, the churches became closely-knit bodies which exercised strict supervision over the life and conduct of their members. Thirdly, membership was based upon acceptance of church covenant, the first part of which was a statement of a severe Calvinist theology.[5]

---

[4] William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Foundations in the South (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1961), pp. 64-66.

As has been mentioned, possibly the most important portion of the Baptists was that group known as the "Separates," who were an off-shoot of the Whitefield Awakening. "The Separates were those who were particularly revivalistic, and separated from the churches which did not support the revival. Thus they became known as Separates. Those who did not thus separate were known as Regulars."[6] This development took place especially in Connecticut, where a total of thirty-one ordained ministers became Separates; of these, five had been Baptists before becoming Separates, and eight others became Baptists shortly afterwards.[7] Among these was Shubal Stearns.

Shubal Stearns (sometimes spelled Shubeal) was born in Boston January 18, 1706. He joined the Congregational Church in Tolland, where he was converted to New Light views by George Whitefield in 1745. He established a New Light church at Tolland, declared himself to be a Baptist in 1751, and was baptised by Paul Palmer. He then organized a Separate Baptist Church in Tolland,

---

[5] George Washington Paschal, History of North Carolina Baptists (Raleigh, N.C.: The General Board, North Carolina Baptist Convention, 1930), I, 211-217, (Hereafter cited as Paschal, History of North Carolina Baptists.)

[6] William Warren Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p.44.

[7] Lumpkin, Baptist Foundations in the South, p. 18, quoting Isaac Backus, "History of the Baptists," p. 204.

and was ordained as its pastor May 20, 1751.[8] Another who was moved by Whitefield at the same time was Daniel Marshall. Although they were strangers at the time, their lives were later tied together with results that were to be important for the religious life of North Carolina.[9] Stearns became convinced that he had a call to serve as a minister on the frontier. Accompanied by five couples, most, if not all, of them related, Stearns left Tolland, probably in August 1754, and traveled via New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and the Potomac Valley, presumably reaching the Winchester area before cold weather. He first settled on Cacapon Creek in Hampshire County, Virginia.[10] Here Stearns began to preach, but he did not find a warm welcome, as the churches were not accustomed to the emotional preaching which was typical of the New Light minister. Also, Mrs. Stearns may have begun her work as an "exhorter," and a woman speaking in church was also novel. When the Indians became restless after the defeat of the British General Braddock in 1755, the area around Winchester was rapidly evacuated, and the Stearns party left Virginia in the summer of that year, went up the Shenandoah valley, crossed the Blue Ridge into Pittsylvania County, Virginia, and finally settled in what is now Randolph County, North Carolina.[11]

---

[8] _Ibid._, p. 21.

[9] _Ibid._, p. 10.

[10] Benedict, _General History_, p. 683.

It would have been difficult to have chosen a more advantageous spot in which to create a center of evangelistic activity than Sandy Creek where Stearns settled. Three major trails there intersected: (1) The Settlers' Trail or Philadelphia Wagon Road from Pennsylvania to South Carolina, the route over which much of the migration to the Carolinas traveled, (2) the Boone Trail from Wilmington west to the Yadkin River country, and (3) the Trading Path from the Norfolk area in southeastern Virginia to the Waxhaw country.[12] Here the Stearns party of sixteen organized the Sandy Creek Baptist Church on November 22, 1755.[13] Joseph Breed and Daniel Marshall had joined the party in Virginia, Marshall having married Stearns' sister. Stearns was selected as their minister, with Marshall and Breed, neither of whom were ordained, as assistants. Almost immediately, an itinerate ministry was initiated. One preaching point was at Deep River in Chatham County where converts included Nathaniel Powell and James Turner, who visited the Particular Baptist Church at the mouth of the Cape Fear River and converted it to the Separate conviction. This was later known as Lockwood's Folly Church.[14] By the end of 1755, preaching missions had been conducted all the way to New Bern and apparently the whole region was aroused. John Newton adopted Separatist views but was not ordained until 1757 when he became pastor of the Black River Church in Duplin County. Ezekiel Hunter, of New River, apparently had a similar experience. In 1756, Daniel Marshall spent much time at Abbott's Creek, and he also transformed the Grassy Creek Church from General to Separate views. Thus by 1758, three churches, Sandy Creek, Abbott's Creek and Deep River, had been established with a total membership of over nine hundred, with vigorous branches at Little River (Montgomery County), Grassy Creek (Granville County), Black River (Duplin County), New River (Oslow County), and Lockwood's Folly (Brunswick County). Thus preaching was established from the Moravian Country in the west to Cape Fear and northward to the Virginia line.[15]

---

[11] Ibid., p. 683.

[12] Lumpkin, Baptist Foundations in the South, p. 38.

[13] Edwards, Materials, p. 384.

Stearns died November 20, 1771 at the age of sixty-five years. By that time, the Separate movement had grown to forty-five churches which had produced 125 ministers. Branches had been established as far west as the Mississippi River, southward as far as Georgia, eastward to the sea and north to the Potomac.[16]

---

[14] Lumpkin, *Baptist Foundations in the South*, pp. 42, 43.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

As the Separate movement was fully established during the lifetime of Stearns, this might be a proper time to evaluate its significance. Before the time of Stearns, much of North Carolina had been a religious desert; the Separate Baptists provided an indigenous ministry that knew the language of the frontier. These were poor farmers, living on a subsistance agriculture; most of the Separate ministers served without salaries, sometimes receiving gifts that might amount to twenty pounds a year, but largely supporting themselves from their own farms. Life was hard, amusements few, and a Baptist campmeeting was the big event of the year. By their evangelistic approach, they opened the way for the later coming of the Methodists, and thus increased their effectiveness. Baptist insistence on voluntarism and democracy struck a responsive note among people who had fled from authoritarianism of one type or another. They provided religious leadership in an area that had never known any. Their zeal for religious liberty had helped build an atmosphere in which political democracy could and did flourish. Their scorn for ruling classes and fancy living fitted the mood of the frontier.[17]

---

[16] Edwards, Materials, p. 385.

[17] Lumpkin, Baptist Foundations in the South, pp. 147-150.

Historically, they became the chief components of the Baptist population of the South, both black and white. They moderated the creedalism of the regulars, yet maintained a degree of control over the local churches which proved valuable in maintaining unity and church discipline. They contributed a spirit of self-consciousness and self-sufficiency under lay leadership. Their insistence of public confession of faith made religion an intensely personal affair.[18]

In the consideration of church discipline within the Baptist denomination, the strictly congregational policy and the subsequent lack of any generally accepted Book of discipline demand a slightly different approach in determining the standards of ethical conduct required of members. Each church is entirely independent, not only of other churches but of the higher echelons of denominational organization. The association, composed of churches within a particular geographical area, acts in an advisory capacity only. It can receive queries from local churches regarding theological positions, church administration and the personal conduct of members, and in its answers it can express the convictions of the ministers and leading layment attending the sessions, but any such answer, or any resolution passed by the association, is not binding upon any church against its will. The Convention of North Carolina Baptist churches was established to facilitate cooperation in missionary enterprises; examination of its Minutes failed to reveal a single instance in which any query regarding personal conduct expected of members had been referred to the State Convention by either a church or an association. Information regarding such standards must be sought in the records of individual churches and associations.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 154ff.

At the time of organization, each Baptist church usually adopted a series of documents, including a statement of faith, sometimes a constitution, and always a set of rules of decorum. The last of these deals primarily with the conduct of church conferences, including such matters as attendance, especially by male members, calling roll and checking absentees, and a prohibition of leaving a conference before it was officially closed. Frequently, however, the rules of decorum also include statements concerning the conduct of members in their daily lives. A typical example might be found in the following extract from the Rules of Decorum adopted by the Briar Creek Church in Wilkes County, in 1851:

> 11. All grievances shall be attended to agreeable to Scripture before it [sic] [is] laid before the Church.
>
> 12. All public and scandalous Reports Reaching the Church against any of its members ought to be Enquired into for the honor of the cause and the Church.

> 13. On all references or Questions to be discussed or other business to be transacted in the Church the Church may determine whether the business shall be decided by a committee or by a majority vote or by a unanimous vote - the receiving and exclusion of members shall be by unanimous vote.
>
> 14. Any members standing before the Church for the purpose of accusing another or excusing him or her self shall be permitted to Call God to witness what they assert.
>
> 16. No member of Briar Creek Church knowing his or her Brother or Sister to be in sinful transgression and lets it pass unnoticed for two Church meetings shall be permitted to bring a charge for the same.
>
> 17. Any member who shall be engaged in any wedding or other gathering or partaking of any plays, They chall be called into acount for the same and dealt with as it as inconsistent with the Christian conduct.
>
> 18. Any member who makes a common practice of visiting and keeping company at the house or houses of ill fame and base character or visiting grog shops shall be called to account for the same.[19]

A more general statement is to be found in the Constitution of the Brown Creek Baptist Church in Anson County, adopted in 1840"

> Article the 6th. This Church shall keep good and wholesome discipline amongst its members, and for this purpose there shall be rules of decorum by which to be governed in her conference meeting and otherwise and shall have power to deal with her members for a violation of the constitution or her rules of decorum. She shall have power also to deal with her members for breach of gospel injunction or for charge of immorality or heterodox notions and

---

[19] Briar Creek Baptist Church, Minutes, 1783-1860, (Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tennessee. Positive copy, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.), 26 July 1851, pp. 130-132. (Hereafter cited as Briar Creek Church, Minutes).

> may acquit, reprove or exclude as the nature of the case may require but in dealing with her members she shall adhere strictly to New Testament usage.
>
> Article the 7th. No member shall be received into the Church if any of the body oppose it but members may be excluded by a majority.[20]

At their annual meetings, Baptist associations frequently chose one of their ministers to prepare a "circular letter" to be presented and acted upon at the following session. At times the topic was determined by the association, but sometimes the choice was left to the author. These letters were designed to express the concern of the leadership of the churches over theological, administrative or ethical issues. As noted above, in view of Baptist policy, such communications were not directive in nature but they did express the views of the leadership of the churches. The circular letters were included in the printed Minutes and thus were distributed to the churches comprising the association and to other groups with which it was in fellowship and correspondence.

Two associations devoted their 1848 circular letters to church discipline. Briar Creek letter was fairly short. It opens with a discussion of Gospel Order in settling disputes between members as outlined in Matthew

---

[20] Brown Creek Baptist Church, Records, 1840-1857 (Microfilm by North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), August , 1840. (Hereafter cited as Brown Creek Church, Records.)

18:15-17. This passage prescribes that a member having a matter against a fellow-member was to take it up with him personally. If this failed to produce a settlement, he was to take two or three other members with him and make another attempt. If this also failed, the case was to be brought before the church and if a member failed to abide by the decision there, "let him be to you as a publican and a sinner." It may be noted that this was also the basic pattern of action in both the Society of Friends and the Methodist Church. The letter goes on to discuss the sins against God mentioned in Galations 5:19-21 and takes the position that these sins could not be forgiven by the church. In these cases, the church was to deal with the offender in an attempt to get him to seek forgiveness from God; if this effort failed, he was to be excluded. The sins in this category included "adultery, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresy, envying, murders, drunkenness, revelling and such like."[21]

The Circular Letter of the Green River Association, composed of churches in Rutherford County, in the mountains, is somewhat more extensive. In the first place, it points out that the decisions of the Association have moral authority only. It defines "discipline" as "order and regularity in the government of the Church, derived solely from the Word of God. . . . It is designed to effect the observance of those means by which the holiness, comfort and usefulness of Christians may be preserved and improved." The Letter then goes on to issue warnings to the churches in the exercise of discipline. Care was to be taken to distinguish between faults which were the result of sudden temptation and those which came from premeditation and habit. Young men were to be treated on the basis of equality but age and church office called for deference. Parties who sought to create division in the church were to be avoided. Expelled members were to be shut off from all social intercourse, although business relations might be continued. Neither wealth nor poverty were to be considered in the maintainance of discipline. Those guilty of the great sins, especially fornication and adultery, were to be excommunicated immediately to clear the church of any appearance of immorality. A second case of drunkenness should result in excommunication.[22]

---

[21] Briar Creek Baptist Association, Minutes, 1825-1929 (Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy, Wake Forest college Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1848, pp. 5-7. (Hereafter cited as Briar Creek Association, Minutes.)

---

[22] North Carolina Associations, Green River Association, Minutes, 1843-1964 (Microfilm by North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), 1848, pp. 3-7. (Hereafter cited as Green River Association, Minutes.)

While the above injunctions are local in their application, they do represent a fairly accurate general picture of Baptist procedure in church discipline. It is now necessary to explore some of the areas in which North Carolina Baptists sought advice or made decisions regarding the conduct of their members.

One area in which questions arose was that of the competency of evidence in church trials. Bear Creek Church asked the Yadkin Association whether it was Scriptural to receive evidence from non-members and received a negative reply.[23] The same question came up a little later, in 1846, in the Cape Fear Association and received a different answer. Here the decision was that a church was presumed to be able to evaluate the competency of evidence and should judge it without respect to its coming from a member or a "worldling."[24] Cane Creek Church addressed the same query to the Green River Association, which decided after much discussion that testimony from non-members might be received but that it should not be considered as equal to that given by members.

---

[23] North Carolina Associations, Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1786-1959 (Microfilm by the Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1831. (Hereafter cited as Yadkin Association, Minutes).

[24] North Carolina Associations, Cape Fear Baptist Association, Minutes, 1808-1898 (Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1840, 0.4. (Hereafter cited as Cape Fear Association, Minutes).

It might be used to complement but not to contradict evidence given by Christians.[25] Green River was asked whether a wife could testify for or against her husband, both of them being members. The Association answered that church membership being a purely personal matter, the marriage relationship did not debar a wife from testifying.[26]

Other queries also concerned trials. Yadkin Association reported that it knew no Biblical precedent for decision by a majority.[27] Cape Fear Association was queried whether a member who had been tried and acquitted could be tried again on the same charge. Its answer was in the affirmative, provided new evidence was available.[28] Mt. Vernon Church asked Yadkin Association if it were in accordance with gospel order to exclude a member without a hearing; the answer was in the negative.[29] The same Association voted that it was not proper to restore a member "under dealings" without some acknowledgement of guilt and satisfaction to the aggrieved party.[30]

---

[25] Green River Association, Minutes, 1850, p. 2.

[26] Ibid., 1859, p. 4.

[27] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1812.

[28] Cape Fear Association, Minutes, 1840, pp. 3, 4.

[29] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1849, p. 5.

[30] Ibid., 1815.

Members expelled from one church were not to be received into another without first obtaining letters of dismissal from their original churches.[31]

Both Chowan and Green River Associations received queries regarding members who had removed from the vicinity of their churches. Chowan indicated that members who had moved to such a distance that the church could have no connection with them and who did not take letters of dismissal had forfeited their membership.[32] Green River answered a similar question by advising the exclusion of members who had gone for two years without requesting letters.[33] Yadkin Association was asked about members who neglected to attend meetings, even after having been admonished. It advised the Church to use all possible means to bring such a member to a sense of his duty, but if this failed and discipline had to be used, it was to be done "tenderly."[34]

The Island Ford Baptist Church asked if there were scriptural authority for calling a presbytery[35] to defrock a delinquent minister. [The case in point will be noted in the study of the Island Ford Church.] The answer of the Association was that no gospel authority existed for such action.[36]

---

[31] Cape Fear Association, Minutes, 1847, p. 6.

[32] North Carolina Associations, Chowan Baptist Association, Minutes, 1806-1914 (Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy, Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1808. (Hereafter cited as Chowan Association, Minutes.)

[33] Green River Association, Minutes, 1857, p. 4.

[34] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1815.

The problems of making, selling and using "ardent spirits" or "spirituous liquors" brought many queries to the associations. In addition, associational bodies frequently concerned themselves with alcohol and adopted circular letters or resolutions dealing with the subject. Well before the middle of the century many of the associations had temperance committees whose reports each year were appended to the minutes for general circulation among the churches.

One of the first associations to mention alcohol was Chowan when in its 1810 letter it condemned all forms of intemperance but especially the use of liquor. Failure here could "cause the world to say there is little or nothing in religion."[37] In 1830, this Association resolved that "the churches comprising this Association be requested to endeavour to suppress this practice [drinking ardent spirits] so far as their circumstances should afford them the opportunity."[38] In 1836, ministers were encouraged to preach temperance sermons and to attempt to remove prejudices against the movement.[39] In the following year, churches were urged to expel members for drunkenness.[40] By 1848, Chowan adopted a resolution requesting members of the churches to discontinue the use of spirituous liquors entirely.[41] In 1854, a query was sent in, asking whether it was consistent for a Christian to manufacture or sell alcoholic drinks or to use them as a beverage. The question was decided in the negative.[42]

---

[35] In the records studied, the phrase "presbytery" was frequently used to refer to an ad hoc committee of neighboring pastors, usually called to establish new churches, ordain ministers or settle disputes between members of different churches.

[36] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1848, p. 5.

[37] Chowan Association, Minutes.

Another coastal association, Cape Fear, began taking action regarding temperance in 1831 with a recommendation to the churches that members abstain from the use of ardent spirits.[43] In 1834, the Committee on Temperance included in its report, which was accepted and printed, a resolution that the churches not only discontinue the use of ardent spirits but that they "employ their best efforts to promote the interest of Temperance

---

[38] *Ibid.*, 1830.

[39] *Ibid.*, 1836.

[40] *Ibid.*, 1837.

[41] *Ibid.*, 1848, p. 16.

[42] *Ibid.*, 1854, p. 6.

[43] Cape Fear Association, *Minutes*, 1831. p. 2.

Societies." In the preamble to this resolution, the use of ardent apirits as a drink was condemned as a "great obstacle to the holy influence of the Gospel."[44] Apparently some churches had excluded members for taking a temperance pledge, for in 1840 a query came in concerning what action should be taken with such excluded members. The Association unanimously voted that such exclusions were improper and that a church doing it was quite out of order.[45] In 1849, the Association voted that members who traded in ardent spirits would be urged to stop, and if they persisted they should be expeled.[46] The report of the Temperance Committee the same year attacked the use of the phrase "moderate drinking" and defined "temperance" as "the moderate use of what is beneficial and the total abstinence from what is injurious and hurtful." It then went on to cite medical opinion that the use of ardent spirits was never beneficial even if a person were in good health. Thus, since no spirits were needed, any use was immoderation and intemperance.[47] The Temperance Committee of 1858 took the position that the example of the "dram-drinker" was more dangerous than that of the drunkard, especially if the former were a church member.[48]

---

[44] *Ibid.*, 1834, p. 5.

[45] *Ibid.*, 1840, p. 4.

[46] *Ibid.*, 1849, p. 3.

[47] *Ibid.*, 1849, p. 6.

Goshen Baptist Association, composed of churches located in Duplin, Sampson, Onslow and New Hanover counties in the south-eastern part of the State, in 1839 adopted a recommendation to its churches that they employ every practical means to promote total abstinence among their members.[49]

Yadkin Association in the mountains, one of the oldest in the State, began to express its concern with problems connected with alcohol at an early date. In 1789 it affirmed its belief that for a member to treat voters at an election was an act of disorder.[50] Then it took no further action until 1836, when it asked member churches not to offer ardent spirits during sessions of the Association or other religious gatherings.[51] The report of the Temperance Committee in 1858 called for a united effort to banish intemperance from the church. The same session passed a resolution advising the churches not to recognize as a minister of the gospel any man who used ardent spirits as a beverage.[52]

---

[48] Ibid., 1858, p. 12.

[49] North Carolina Associations, Goshen Baptist Association, Minutes, 1827-1843 (Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1839, p. 3. (Hereafter cited as Goshen Association, Minutes.)

[50] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1789.

[51] Ibid., 1836.

Tuckasiege Association, also in the mountains, first expressed its concern regarding temperance in 1840, when it adopted a resolution urging its churches to use their influence to "arrest the evils of intemperance" and strongly suggested that making, selling or using intoxicating liquor as a beverage be made a subject of church discipline.[53]

Perhaps the fullest expression of the arguments for making total abstinence a condition of church membership is to be found in the Circular Letter adopted by the Tuckasiege Association in the same year, 1840. The Letter opens by disclaiming any desire to legislate for the churches or to dictate their actions, and goes on to point out that the matter had been much discussed within the churches. It then takes the firm position that "entire abstinence from all intoxicating liquors as a beverage ought to be declared a term of communion in every church." The phrase "total abstinence" is defined to include not only drinking but also manufacture and sale. Medical and sacramental use is not included in the prohibition.

---

[52] Ibid., 1858, pp. 10, 13.

[53] North Carolina Associations, Tuckasiege Baptist Association, Minutes, 1829-1866 (Microfilm by the Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Positive copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1840, p. 4. (Hereafter cited as Tuckasiege Association, Minutes.)

The Letter then considers and counters three chief objections to the proposed policy. The first is that it goes beyond gospel injunctions and therefor is in effect legislating for Christ. The answer is that the proposal is not legislation but rather the judicial interpretation of what is law in the church. It is pointed out that similar action had been taken in banning gambling, theatrical amusements and other follies because they were enemies of holiness. The second objection is that it would be a denial of the rights and liberties of members. The answer to this is that the demand would deprive no one of anything except the right to sin. According to the third ground for opposition, it is not right to lay upon members who used alcoholic beverages a test which was not in effect when they had joined the church. The answer is that the late recognition of a practice as evil does not give a person the right to sin just because he had been a member of the church for forty years. The only valid question is whether the practice itself is evil. The Letter takes the position that intemperance is the cause of most of the difficulties experienced within the churches, including quarrels, bickerings, exclusions and even the loss of ministers. Adoption of total abstinence as a condition of membership would eliminate most of the disciplinary problems which the churches face.[54]

In 1851, the Tuckasiege Association answered a query with the statement that as making, selling or drinking spirituous liquors laid hold on death and hell, they should be abandoned by all Christians.[55]

The Minutes of the Flat River Association, composed of churches located in Orange, Granville, Person, Warren and Wake counties in North Carolina and Mecklenberg County in Virginia, contain three references to the use of ardent spirits. In 1846, the Association adopted the report of the Temperance Committee which contained a resolution affirming that the making, selling and use of intoxicating spirits were derogatory to Christian character and recommending that the churches use "all proper vigilence and zeal" to persuade their members to abandon such practices.[56] In 1852, the Association voted that "the traffic in ardent spirits is a business incompatible with Christianity and the precepts of the Bible."[57] In 1857, all ministers were asked to preach temperance sermons at least once a year.[58]

---

[54] _Ibid_., 1840, pp. 6-8.

[55] _Ibid_., 1854, p. 3.

[56] North Carolina Associations, Flat River Baptist Association, _Minutes_, _1821-1959_ (Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn., positive copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.), 1846, p. 8. (Hereafter cited as Flat River Association, _Minutes_.)

[57] _Ibid_., 1852, p. 5.

The first expression made by the Green River Association concerning alcohol was a condemnation of treating by political candidates as "corrupting our elective franchise and demoralizing the community."[59] A resolution adopted in 1852 asserted the belief that making, selling and using ardent apirits as a common drink were great evils and called for their discontinuance to aid in the promotion of truth and the prosperity of society.[60] Possibly the strongest action taken by an association found in this study was a resolution passed unanimously by the Green River Association in 1857, in which it pledged itself to withdraw recognition of any church which permitted its members to distill or retail spirituous liquors.[61] The Minutes of the following year commented on the fact that all of the churches of the Association had reported themselves to be rid of distillers and retailers, and that the Association itself was a model temperance body.[62] A query in 1859 asked whether the resolution of 1857 also applied to members having their fruit or grain distilled . The reply was that the intention of the Association when the resolution was adopted was to "rid itself of all members who engaged in distilling, either directly or indirectly" and that it was not the desire of the body for its members to assist in distillation in any way.[63] The implication would seem to be that furnishing the raw materials for distillation was an aid to the industry and therefore was banned.

---

[58] Ibid., 1857, p. 14.

[59] Green River Association, Minutes, 1849, p. 2.

[60] Ibid., 1852, p. 7.

[61] Ibid., 1857, p. 5.

[62] Ibid., 1858, p. 5.

A number of individual churches also took actions in regard to the manufacture, sale and use of ardent spirits. In 1827, Hepzibah Church, located some miles east of Raleigh, appointed a committee to prosecute every person who bought or sold spirits within one mile of the meeting house on the Sabbath. In addition, the church promised to repay the committee for any expenses they incurred in the process.[64] Mt. Pisgah Church in Chatham County resolved to "enforce the law against each and every person who may buy or sell spirituous liquors or any other thing within the distance guaranteed us as a religious body by the laws of the Land during our appointed times of public worship."[65] Hepzibah Church also voted that the signature of a pledge of abstinence was all that was to be required for the restoration of a member to full fellowship when he was under a charge of intoxication.[66] In 1859, the purchase of ardent spirits for retail at a profit was banned.[67] Mt. Tabor Church, in Hertford County, decided in 1842 that retailing ardent spirits was contrary to gospel order and rendered the guilty party liable to disciplinary action.[68] The Kenansville Baptist Church, in Duplin County, took similar action in 1844, except that it was more specific in that it stated that members who persisted in retailing ought not to be retained in membership.[69] Brown Creek Church voted that it was wrong for a member of that Church to retail spirits.[70] Mt. Pisgah also took similar action.[71] Salem Baptist Church, in Pasquotank County on the Atlantic Coast, voted that any member who had been expelled on account of the use of ardent spirits was not to be restored unless he promised not to use them any more, and that if he broke the pledge he automatically expelled himself without the necessity of any trial.[72]

---

[63] Ibid., 1859, p. 3.

[64] Hepzibah Baptist Church, Records, 1809-1925 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), March, 1842. (Hereafter cited as Hepzibah Church, Records).

---

[65] Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church, Minutes, 1814-1869 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), March, 1858. Hereafter cited as Mt. Pisgah Church, minutes).

[66] Hepzibah Church, Records, June 1842, I, 90.

[67] Ibid., 1859, I, 145.

[68] Mt. Tabor Baptist Church, Minutes, 1839-1878 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), March, 1832. (Hereafter cited as Mt. Tabor, Minutes).

[69] Kenansville Baptist Church, Journal, Vol. I, 1837-1923 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), September 1844. (Hereafter cited as Kenansville Church, Journal).

[70] Brown Creek Church, Minutes, May 27, 1854.

A special aspect of the alcohol problem involved the relationship of the churches with the Order of the Sons of Temperance, a fraternal organization established in 1842. This became a critical issue among North Carolina Baptists by 1851, when a number of actions were taken in regard to the Order. The Temperance Committee of Cape Fear Association in its report for 1851 gave strong support to the organization and pointed out that it had been established in 1842, that the first chapter in North Carolina, Concord No. 1 in Raleigh, was the seventh in the world, and that its membership had grown to 300,000 in the nation with 300 chapters and 12,000 members in the State.[73] In October of the same year the Island Ford Baptist Church unanimously requested the Yadkin

---

[71] Mt. Pisgah Church, Minutes, April 2, 1852.

[72] Salem Baptist Church, Minutes, 1803-1854 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), September 10, 1831. (Hereafter cited as Salem Church, Minutes.)

[73] Cape Fear Association, Minutes, 1851, p. 10.

Association to adopt a resolution providing that membership in the Sons of Temperance should not be a bar to church membership, but that all should be free to join or not as they desired.[74] The requested resolution was passed by the Association at its ensuing session.[75] This was followed by another resolution the next year, 1852, advising any churches that had excluded members for joining the Sons of Temperance to reconsider their action, and also suggesting that any members who had joined should not cast reflections upon their brethren who had refrained from so doing.[76] The Cross Roads Baptist Church at Mocksville took a different position, declaring that it would not fellowship with any who joined the Sons, or who wished the Order well.[77] In March of 1854 the Church took up the issue again, repassed the same resolution and expelled fifteen members for refusal to accept the decision of the majority.[78] The excluded members took the issue to the Yadkin Association which in turn adopted a resolution which stated that the Cross Roads Church had acted contrary to the counsel of the Association and recommended that the Church rescind the entire action and give the excluded members a "cordial and personal invitation to return to the fellowship of the Church." The members involved were also advised to accept any invitation that was extended to them.[79] Briar Creek Association adopted a similar resolution in 1852, advising churches which had excluded members for joining the Sons of Temperance to reconsider their action and to make membership in the Sons not a test of fellowship.[80]

---

[74] Island Ford Baptist Church, Jonesville, N.C., Minutes, 1890-1936 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), November, 1853. (Hereafter cited as Island Ford Church, Minutes).

[75] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1851, p. 3.

[76] *Ibid.*, 1852, p. 5.

[77] Cross Roads Baptist Church, Mocksville, N.C., Minutes, 1851-1890 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), November, 1853. (Hereafter cited as Cross Roads Church, Minutes).

[78] *Ibid.*, March, 1854.

A serious problem arose in the Green River Association in connection with the Sons of Temperance. A committee was appointed to hear complaints made by a minority of the Ebenezer Church. Specifically, the Church was charged with expelling Jackson Blanton for joining the Sons and L. L. Deck for being a Son, although he had joined the Order before joining the Church. The committee, after hearing the evidence, recommended that the two men be restored to membership in the Church. This the Church refused to do by a vote of thirty-five to sixteen. The minority then stated that they wished to join other churches, and the committee gave them letters of dismissal on behalf of the Association.[81]

---

[79] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1854, pp. 6, 7.

[80] Briar Creek Association, Minutes, 1852, p. 6.

Another church that was split over the issue of the Sons of Temperance was the Briar Creek Church. In 1852, it adopted a resolution stating that membership in the Sons was not to be a test of fellowship. The minority refused to accept the decision of the Church.[82] The dissenting members then withdrew and constituted themselves as a new church.[83] In November, the Briar Creek Church voted to give the members of the new organization until March, 1853, to come back to their old relationship. Later, the deadline was postponed until June and again until August.[84]

Here, then, were two churches that were split over the issue of the Sons of Temperance, but taking opposite sides on the question. The whole situation is an example of the way in which independent Baptist churches took different positions on controversial issues and of the inadvisability of making sweeping generalizations regarding Baptist standards of conduct without leaving room for local variations.

As will be seen later in this study when the disciplinary experiences of various churches are studied, the opposition to the Sons of Temperance was probably not based upon a rejection of its principles, for church trials for drunkenness continued even in the Cross Roads Church, but apparently was due to the fact that it was a secret order. This conclusion is buttressed by actions that were taken in regard to freemasonry. Yadkin Association answered a query with the statement that it was not lawful to keep in fellowship members who joined the Masons or who attended their lodges.[85] Later, the Chowan Association was also queried concerning Masonry. Its reply was that as an Association it had no knowledge of Masonry and therefore did not feel itself competent to approve or condemn its principles. However, in the interest of Christian unity, it advised ministers and members not to join the Order, and if already initiated to refrain from attendance upon lodge meetings in order to avoid wounding the tender feelings of their brethren.[86] In 1835 the matter came up again, and a committee report was accepted which took the position that while the Order had originally been worthy it had been so corrupted by evil men joining it that church members should avoid attendance.[87] Earlier, Mt. Pisgah Church voted that it did not sanction its members joining the Masons,[88] and in the following year it passed a resolution not to invite any minister to serve the Lord's Supper if he were a Mason.[89] On the other hand, the Fayetteville Church voted to permit both the Sons of Temperance and the Masons to use its building for public lectures.[90]

---

[81] Green River Association, Minutes, 1854, pp. 2, 3.

[82] Briar Creek Church, Minutes, July 25 [1852], p. 133.

[83] Ibid., 12 September [1852], p. 134.

[84] Ibid., 28 November [1852], p. 135, also pp. 137, 138.

---

[85] Yadkin Association, Minutes, 28 October, 1791.

[86] Chowan Association, Minutes, 1822.

[87] *Ibid.*, 1835.

Other moral issues received scattered attention. Specific questions regarding Sabbath observance came up in several areas. Meherrin Baptist Church asked Chowan Association about seining fish on the Sabbath. The reply stated that any such activity was inconsistent with the principles of the gospel and expressed its disapproval of any sort of labor on the Lord's Day except in the service of God or in cases of absolute necessity.[91] The Cape Fear Association in its Circular Letter of 1819 condemned "unnecessary visiting, idle roving from house to house . . . triffling sports and sinful amusements" on the Sabbath."[92] As might be expected from the fact that it too was a coastal association, Cape Fear was queried about the matter of fishing on Sunday. The United Church brought up the issue, on the ground that the fishing season was short and some of its members felt that they had to make the best of the limited time. Besides, some of them worked for commercial fishermen who were not members of the church and who sent their boats out on Sunday. The Association replied that any such activity was a direct violation of God's Word and that those who were guilty were subject to church discipline.[93] Flat River Association advised that a member who habitually started business trips on Sunday should be admonished and if he persisted he should be expelled as a disorderly person.[94] In one instance, Hepzibah Church was quite specific; it voted that any member who went to market in Raleigh on the Sabbath Day should be dealt with.[95]

---

[88] Mr. Pisgah Church, Minutes, August, 1825.

[89] Ibid., April, 1826.

[90] First Baptist Church, Fayetteville, Minutes, 1848-1870, (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.),

[91] Chowan Association, Minutes, 1844, p. 13.

[92] Cape Fear Association, Minutes, 1819.

Quite a few actions were taken in the general area of amusements and diversions. Chowan Association decided that parents who sent their children to balls and dancing classes should be deal with by the Church in the same manner as other offenders.[96] Attendance at balls or dancing parties was condemned by the Flat

---

[93] Ibid., 1856, p. 4.

[94] Flat River Association, Minutes, 1845, p. 6.

[95] Hepzibah Church, Records, April, 1839.

[96] Chowan Association, Minutes, 1807.

River Association as entirely wrong and inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel.[97] Mt. Pisgah Church decided that fiddling, dancing and the "Scotch Ramble" were sinful and brought reproach upon the Church.[98] This position was reiterated in 1860.[99] Hepzibah Church included not only the Scotch Ramble but the French Ramble and "any other species of dancing" in its condemnation of dancing as derogatory to Christian character.[100] Earlier, Mt. Pisgah had banned "playing and singing play songs."[101] In 1837, Hepzibah Church resolved that participation in any play made a member subject to censure.[102] Cross Roads Church received a query asking whether it was in accordance with the gospel for a member of the church to join with "worldlings" in "civil plays:" its answer was in the negative.[103]

Business activities were the cause of some queries. Chowan Association was asked whether it was consistent with Christian principles for a church member to purchase slaves with the intent of selling them to speculators. The answer was that the practice was "at open war with the spirit of the gospel and shocking to all the tender feelings of our nature."[104] The same Association ruled that the purchasers of lottery tickets were proper subjects for church discipline.[105] On the subject of gambling, the Mt. Pisgah Church voted that it was not agreeable with the gospel for a member of a Baptist church to conduct a shooting match for a prize, specifically, a beef.[106] Chowan Association had previously condemned the practice of buying notes and obligations at a large discount and then seizing the property of the debtor, even to the extent of making his family to become public charges.[107] Green River Association received a query from the Bills Creek Church asking whether it was consistent with Biblical teaching and Baptist usage for a member to go to law against a Christian brother. The ruling of the Association was that such procedure was proper in ordinary business transactions but not in matters of church fellowship.[108] Finally, to conclude this study of the actions taken by Baptist churches and associations of North Carolina regarding personal behavior, the Buckhorn Church in Hertford County resolved in 1860 that "we for the future will make no use of tobacco while in church."[109]

---

[97] Flat River Association, Minutes, 1842, p. 7.

[98] Mt. Pisgah Church, Minutes, March, 1858.

[99] Ibid., May, 1860.

[100] Hepzibah Church, Records, March 1859, p. 145.

[101] Mt. Pisgah Church, Minutes, May, 1860.

[102] Hepzibah Church, Records, January, 1837.

[103] Cross Roads Church, Minutes, April, 1857.

---

[104] Chowan Association, Minutes, 1818.

[105] Ibid., 1831.

[106] Mt. Pisgah Church, Minutes, September, 1836.

[107] Chowan Association, Minutes, 1808.

[108] Green River Association, Minutes, 1859, p. 3.

A conspicuous note in the above study is the lack of references to the matter of slavery. With the exception of the query to Chowan Association regarding speculation in slaves,[110] not a single query, resolution or circular letter was found which dealt with the institution of human bondage or the treatment of slaves. This is in sharp contrast with the situation in regard to the Methodists, who did considerable thinking in regards to slavery, and especially to the Society of Friends which was adamant in its opposition to the institution. The answer is to be found in the Baptist insistence upon basing church discipline directly on the letter of Biblical injunctions coupled with the fact that in both the Old and the New Testaments, slavery was accepted as a social institution. Hence, any attempt to ban slavery would undoubtedly have been condemned as "legislating for Christ" and thus introducing an unwarranted test of fellowship and membership.

---

[109] Buckhorn Baptist Church, Murfreesboro, N.C., Minutes, 1835-1874 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), January, 1860.

[110] See p. 161, _supra_.

In summary, it may be observed that the purpose of church discipline among the Baptists was to keep the church clear of members who sinned, especially in terms of the Pauline catalog of offenses listed in the Epistle to the Galatians (see above, p. 143). Most of the problems that came up were concerned with judicial interpretation rather than with legislation. Stated differently, the main effort was to determine what was forbidden in the scriptural text rather than to establish new definitions of moral conduct. This is particularly seen in the questions that arose in connection with ardent spirits. The Pauline list of deadly sins included drunkenness; judicial interpretation expanded that prohibition to include the factors which helped produce it. Use of ardent spirits to an extent that did not produce drunkenness was not usually forbidden by the churches, although some churches did encourage such a step. This concept of judicial interpretation was also applied in questions relating to Sabbath observance. One issue that might seem to involve new legislation was that of membership in the Masons. Here no Biblical precedent or injunction was cited, except that when the Chowan Association advised against membership or attendance on the ground that it might hurt the "tender feelings" of other members, it was in line with the concept of Paul regarding eating meat as found in I Cor. 8:7-13.

The Disciplinary Experience

In the exploration of the experience of Baptist churches in the enforcement of accepted standards of personal conduct, the records of forty individual churches, scattered from the Atlantic coast to the western boundary of the State, were examined. Out of this group, nine were selected for detailed analysis, primarily because they had records which covered extensive periods of time and which reported a large number of cases. Wide geographical distribution was also a factor in selection. Two of the churches chosen did not fully meet these requirements but were selected because they represented urban environments; the seven remaining churches were rural. Procedure in examination of the churches will be uniform. First, the individual cases will be listed chronologically, indicating the month in which the case arose, the name of the person involved, the charge and the disposition of the case. This listing will be found in Appendix IV, 307-344. The fact that the accused was Negro will be indicated by the letter "N" following the name. In the listing of charges, the phraseology of the original records is normally used. In the listing of disposition of cases, some modification is made in the interest of uniformity: "excluded" is used to reflect a number of words found in the church records, the most common of which was "excommunicated," while "restored" indicates that the accused acknowledged the truth of the charge made against him, expressed regret for his transgression, promised to mend his ways, asked for and received forgiveness and was restored to full membership and fellowship in the church. The use of the word "restored" in this connection is especially appropriate in view of the fact that an accused was normally excluded from full fellowship and participation in the activity of the church pending final decision on the charges placed against him. Cases that had unusual aspects giving them special interest or significance will be noted and the frequency of individual charges will be tabulated. Finally, an attempt will be made to evaluate the disciplinary experience of North Carolina Baptist churches during the period under study.

The first church chosen for detailed study is the Red Bank Baptist Church in Pitt County.[111] None of the cases which arose in the Red Bank Church are of special interest. Of the fifty-three cases, ten involved Negroes, including two cases each for quarreling, disobedience to masters, intoxication and theft, and one each for trespass and adultery. The total number of cases listed according to the charge was distributed as follows: non-attendance, nine; quarrelling, eight; intoxication, six; fighting, three; disobedience to masters, two; theft, two; leaving church meeting before it was over, two; lying, two; slander, two; permitting gambling and revelling in one's house, two, and one each for trespass, adultery, anger, bigamy, permitting dancing in one's house, assault, traffic in liquor, hostility, keeping a bad house, refusal to take communion in the church, profanity and selling liquor on the Sabbath.

---

[111] Red Bank Primitive Baptist Church, Minutes, 1791-1882, (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), passim. Listing of cases will be found in Appendix IV, 304-306.

All the Negroes who were tried were excluded except Nero who was tried for intoxication and the outcome of whose trial was not indicated in the records and Wiley who was acquitted on a charge of theft. Of the six persons who were tried for intoxication, four were excluded, one was restored but excluded a few months later and the disposition of one was not indicated. Altogether forty members were excluded out of fifty-one who were tried; this was an expulsion rate of approximately eighty per cent.

The next church to be studied in detail is the First Baptist Church of Fayetteville.[112] While the records of this Church do not begin until 1848, it was chosen for examination because it was an urban church, and because its experience in church discipline had unusual features not found elsewhere. It thus provides a contrast that supplements the data found in the study of other urban and rural churches.

---

[112] Fayetteville Church, Minutes, passim. See Appendix IV, 306-308.

Among the seventy-seven charges involving seventy-one members were several that seem to merit individual attention. When the Minutes recorded the expulsion of Elijah Powers for adultery, the phrase "inexcusable crime" was used.[113] Among Baptists, few were ever forgiven for an offense of a sexual nature; this doubtless reflects the Pauline emphasis on the seriousness of violations of a monogamous standard of sexual purity. Samuel Phillips, accused of selling ardent spirits, did not wish to be excluded from the church, but he also did not expect to desist from the practice with which he was charged; his desire to remain in membership was vain.[114] In at least one case a circumlocution was used to avoid mentioning a sexual offense that might have been thought to be especially heinous; Alfred Lawson was excluded for "participating in some of those things characteristic of the vicious, reckless and licentious (Hosea 5th Chap. 3 & 4 verses, Hebrews 13th. Chap. & 4 vs.")[115] A further reflection of the prevalent attitude toward sexual offenses is found in the record of the exclusion of Sarah Jones for adultery: "This being one of the cases which requires no trial [underscoring in original] other than evidence of the fact (of which there was plenty)."[116]

---

[113] Ibid., October 1850, p. 13.

[114] Ibid., 1 December 1853, p. 48.

[115] Ibid., February, 1854, p. 52.

One of the most interesting cases was that of G. L. Jonson, who was tried and forgiven for using profanity. He defended himself on the grounds that his feelings had been sorely tried, and when he was pressed for an explanation, he offered the following:

> At the close of the morning service a few Sabbaths ago, the Pastor gave out 5 verses to be sung--but he (the Pastor) thought the tune selected not appropriate and as the service had been lengthy he pronounced the benediction at the close of the singing of the third verse.[117]

Apparently Brother Jonson had been singing so lustily and enthusiastically that he missed the pastor's cue to stop.

When Benjamin Russel was first tried for selling ardent spirits, he stated that he was not then engaged in the practice but that he saw no impropriety in selling while church members were permitted to buy and drink. For the time being he was excused.[118]

One of the most striking features of the disciplinary experience of the Fayetteville Church was that while approximately one-third of the membership was Negro,[119] not a single defendent was identified as colored; further, full names were given, while in other records, Negroes were identified by a given name only (as a general rule), sometimes supplemented by the name of the owner.

---

[116] Ibid., March 1856, p. 91.

[117] Ibid., 26 May, 1856, p. 97.

[118] Ibid., 7 December, 1857.

Examination of the listing of charges indicates that the most frequent charge was that of selling ardent spirits, which appeared nineteen times, followed by intoxication with fifteen incidents. Dancing and profanity each appeared seven times; adultery and joining other churches three each. The two charges each for immorality and gross immorality were probably in the sexual area. A wide variety of charges occurred only one or twice each and thus are of little significance, except possibly for the two cases of mistreating Negroes, one of which ended in acknowledgment of fault and forgiveness, the other in expulsion.

Of the seventy-one members who were tried, fifty-three were expelled, thus resulting in an expulsion rate of approximately seventy-five per cent. Membership of the Church during the period under study ranged from 350 to 400.

The next Church to be studied in detail is the Hepzibah Baptist Church, located in Wake County, a few miles east of Raleigh. Available records of this Church begin in 1810 and run through the period under study.[120] This was not a large church, but its disciplinary experience was extensive.

---

[119] Ibid., September, 1856, 28 September 1857 and 27 September, 1858.

Despite the large number of cases in Hepzibah, few merit any special notice. One of these involves Jeremiah Roads. First, Mary Griffin was excluded for visiting Roads for "criminal purposes." Then Roads was accused of visiting Polly Griffin for similar purposes, but he was able to explain his conduct satisfactorily and was restored to full fellowship.[121] In another unusual case, Conwell Hood was excommunicated for "chasing William Avery's Negro women in the night."[122] Samuel Strickland was acquitted on a charge of fornication because of the "caretar" of the woman involved.[123] Perhaps the most unusual case is that of Dossey Bridges who was expelled for denying his name, and of William Carpenter who was excluded for being an accessory.[124]

Membership figures for the Hepzibah Church are not as plentiful as might be desired (this is a common problem), but the Church was constituted in 1810 with a membership of ten. A roll made up in 1839 indicated a membership of seventy-six, which rose in 1845 to one-hundred-twenty-three of whom thirty-five were Negro.[125] Considering the limited membership, this Church had a very high number of trials.

---

[120] Hepzibah Church, Records, passim. See Appendix IV, 309-317.

[121] Ibid., August and November, 1826.

[122] Ibid., November, 1837

[123] Ibid., July and August, 1840.

[124] Ibid., January, April and June, 1842.

Analysis of the listing of charges indicates that a total of 223 cases arose, out of which 141 involved white members and 82 colored. Of the cases in which final disposition is indicated, seventy-eight per cent of the whites and eighty-four per cent of the colored members who were tried were excluded, with an over-all exclusion rate of seventy-nine per cent. When it is recalled that a number of offenses were exclusively Negro, specifically disobedience to masters and running away, and that conviction in these cases was almost universal, it would appear that white and colored members received about equal consideration in severity of church discipline.

In the 223 cases, a total of 270 charges were made, distributed as follows:

---

[125] *Ibid.*, December, 1839 and September, 1843.

Charge	White	Negro	Not excluded	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	65	5	23	47	70
Fornication	24	12	9	27	36
Lying	14	16	9	21	30
Theft	3	21	8	16	24
Adultery	4	15	5	14	19
Profanity	11	2	2	11	13
Dancing	9	4	4	9	13
Fighting	3	5	3	5	8
Running away	0	7	3	4	7
Slander	6	0	5	1	6
Disorderly conduct	3	2	1	4	5
Non-attendance	4	0	1	3	4
Concealing stolen goods	1	3	1	3	4
Libel	3	0	2	1	3
Trading in spirits	2	0	1	1	2
Quarrels	2	0	1	1	2
Mistreating wife	1	1	2	0	2
Disobeying master	0	2	0	2	2
Criminal visits	2	0	1	1	2
Slave trade	1	0	0	1	1
Allowing dancing	1	0	0	1	1
Suing a brother	1	0	1	0	1
Denial of one's name	1	0	0	1	1
Accessory to above	1	0	0	1	1
Preaching without authority	0	1	1	0	1
Sabbath-breaking	1	0	1	0	1
Sheltering runaway	1	0	0	1	1
Chasing Negro women at night	1	0	0	1	1
Abortion	0	1	0	1	1
Assisting abortion	0	1	0	1	1
Shooting neighbor's mare	1	0	0	1	1
Blasphemy	1	0	1	0	1
Killing her child	0	1	0	1	1
Deserting family	1	0	1	0	1
Totals	171	99	88	182	270

It will be observed that intoxication was by far the most common charge, accounting for over one-quarter of the total. Of the seventy who were tried for excessive use of ardent spirits, fifty-four or seventy-seven per cent were excluded. This figure very closely parallels the over-all exclusion rate and this indicates that intoxication was considered to be neither more nor less serious than other offenses and that the Church was as free to restore or exclude on this charge as on any other. Combining adultery and fornication gives a total of sixty-five cases, but interestingly enough, fornication was largely a white offense while adultery was the more common among Negro members. As marriage of the guilty party is normally the distinguishing factor between these two offenses, this racial variance would seem too reflect earlier marriage on the part of the Negro membership. Lying was about equally divided, but theft was almost exclusively a colored offense, especially when it is remembered that over two-thirds of the membership was white. Whites were more profane, but the Negro members were more inclined to fighting. Frequency of other charges was too low for the figures to be significant.

Probably the most significant change that time produced was in the percentage of trials that ended in expulsion. These figures by decades (beginning with the establishment of the Church in 1810) for trials whose outcome is indicated are 83, 71, 68, 84 and 100. Of the 69 cases that arose after 1 January 1844, only 2, both of them in 1849, resulted in restoration. No marked change in type of charge is to be noted, except that in the later years there was a decline in frequency of entirely personal charges such as quarreling, and slander.

The fourth church to be studied in detail is the First Baptist Church of Raleigh.[126] While the records of this church are incomplete and do not contain a large number of disciplinary cases, yet its study is desirable because it is an urban church, located in the capital city of the State.

Few cases in Raleigh call for special attention; one that certainly does is that of Clabon, who was tried in 1827 before a church conference that "a considerable number of the white members and nearly all of the blacks" attended. The account of the trial reads as follows:

> A charge against Clabon, a member of the Raleigh Baptist Church and servant of William Sherwood charged with drinking too much spirits at a certain time and at the Same time gitting in a greater passion and Biting of the year [sic] of one of his fellow-servants. He came Furward to the Church and fully acknowledged his crime apparently with deep repentence. But for his good and the good of the Church that he be finally excluded for the space of 3 months.[127]

Mrs. Elizabeth Wedding was charged in October of 1831 with "fiting." She was also alleged to have said that she did not want to be a member of the Baptist Church any longer. In fact, some of the members believed that she had deliberately had her children sprinkled to insure that she was expelled; if this were true, she was successful.[128]

---

[126] First Baptist Church, Raleigh, Minutes, 1812-1832, 1840-1856, 1856-1874 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), passim. (Hereafter cited as Raleigh Church, Minutes). See Appendix IV, 317-319.

[127] *Ibid.*, 19 August 1827.

During the years for which records are available, fifty-five persons were tried on a total of fifty-nine charges; distribution of these charges, and the number which resulted in non-expulsion or expulsion is as follows:

Charge	Not excluded	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	5	8	13
Misconduct	0	7	7
Non-attendance	3	2	5
Theft	0	4	4
Profanity	1	3	4
Immorality	0	3	3
Fornication	0	3	3
Joining other churches	0	3	3
Adultery	2	0	2
Anger	2	0	2
Assault	1	1	1
Fighting	1	1	2
Disorder	1	0	1
Mayhem	1	0	1
Slander	1	0	1
Schism	0	1	1
Trading in Negroes	0	1	1
Sale of liquor	1	0	1
Neglect of church duties	0	1	1
Not stated	0	1	1
Having child sprinkled	0	1	1
Totals	19	40	59

Again, intoxication was the most frequent offense, being responsible for approximately one-fourth of the charges, almost the same ratio as was true in Hepzibah Church, a rural church a few miles to the east of the city. Misconduct, the nature of which is not specified, accounted for seven cases. Only five are definitely identifiable as sexual, although the three for "immorality" should probably be included in this category. Only five Negroes were charged, Clabon who was accused of biting off his fellow-slave's ear, and four in a single incident of theft. Participation of Negroes in the life of the Raleigh Church was prominent for many years; accordingly, the low incidence rate among colored membership is worthy of note. Other charges appear so infrequently as to make their figures to be of little significance.

---

[128] *Ibid.*, 1 October, 22 October, 1831.

One unusual feature of the discipline of the Raleigh Church was its use of suspension as a penalty, which was resorted to four times. Final disposition is not indicated in four cases, one member was acquitted, six were forgiven, one was admonished, and thirty-nine were expelled. Expulsion rate was seventy-seven per cent.

Another unusual feature of the Raleigh Church was its use of a "Vigilant Committee." This group served as an investigating committee in all cases, and also instituted a substantial portion of the charges. However, it never was given authority to take final action in the name of the Church, as was done in some other places.

Another of the churches that experienced a large number of cases of discipline was the Wheeley's (sometimes written "Wheeler's) Church, located near Roxboro in

Person County.[129]

A number of incidents that arose in the Wheeley's Church call for comment. There were at least two instances in which the Church concerned itself with the personal friendship of its members. The first involved Betsy Davis. She had apparently been whispering to a young man by the name of Page during church service. In April of 1802 she was called upon to explain her conduct to the Church, which she was able to do satisfactorily. The following year, however, she was accused again concerning her association with Page. Evidently she thought this was none of the church's business, for she was not able to give satisfaction to the committee that visited her and she was excommunicated.[130] In a somewhat similar case, Polly Murdock was reported as being in disorder by "keeping company with or being to intermet [sic] with a certain Mr. Lashly." She was acquitted on the testimony of her husband.[131]

Another defendent who was acquitted on the evidence of the supposedly injured party was Jeremiah Rimmer, who was accused of personally abusing a Mr. Mason at his residence in Roxboro. Rimmer presented a letter from Mason which cleared him.[132]

---

[129] Wheeley's Baptist Church, Minute Book. 1791-1898 (Manuscript, II volumes, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.), passim. (Hereafter cited as Wheeley's Church, Minute Book). See Appendix IV, 319-328.

[130] Ibid., April and May, 1802, I, 48, 49 and February and March, 1803, I, 52, 53.

[131] Ibid., July 1834, I, 233.

A most unusual case, possibly unique in this study, was that of Nancy Blalock, who was accused of charging John Hawkins, his wife and Sister Milley Burch with bewitching her livestock. She was expelled.[133]

Another charge concerning stock involves Mirny Whitfield who was accused of opening his fence, letting out his hogs and thus destroying the fruit of his neighbor. He was also accused of using harsh words to Fanny Hargis, but was cleared of all charges.[134]

But perhaps the most intriguing case of all concerns Baylor Burch. He informed the Church that there were reports that he had kissed Sister Susannah Clayton. He denied the story, but confessed that he had gone "to her bed-room in the night and rubed his beard in her face." Both were expelled.[135]

Turning to an analysis of the over-all disciplinary experience of Wheeley's Church, we find several features worthy of comment. In the first place, a total of forty different charges were used, which is the largest of any church which was surveyed. A total of 236 accusations were made against individuals, distributed as follows:

---

[132] _Ibid_., March 1837, I, 244.

[133] _Ibid_., July [1842], I 252.

[134] _Ibid_., March, November, 1830, I, 217, 220.

[135] _Ibid_., May, July, 1804, I, 63, 64.

Charge	Restored	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	63	13	76
Anger	24	1	25
Quarrels and disputes	20	3	23
Disorderly conduct	7	11	18
Fighting	11	3	14
Undue familiarity	2	4	6
Non-attendance	0	6	6
Selling liquor	3	3	6
Gambling	1	4	5
Sabbath-breaking	4	0	4
Fornication	1	3	4
Theft	0	3	3
"Attending pleasure meeting"	0	2	2
Adultery	0	2	2
Wife-beating	2	0	2
Bigamy	0	2	2
Fraud	0	2	2
Improper language	2	0	2
Personal abuse	1	1	2
Assault	1	1	2
Profanity	2	0	2
Dancing	2	0	2
Cause not stated	0	2	2
Pregnancy while single	0	2	2
Wrestling	2	0	2
Suits at law against members	1	1	2
Slander	0	2	2
Hostility	1	0	1
Breaking up a marriage	1	0	1
Horse-racing	0	1	1
Bastardy	0	1	1
False accounts	1	0	1
Damaging property	1	0	1
Permitting disorderly house	1	0	1
Giving military book to slave	1	0	1
Open communion	0	1	1
Horse-trade	1	0	1
Illegal reception into church	0	1	1
Non-fellowship over above case	0	1	1
Cock-fighting	0	1	1
Fight with white man	0	1	1
Removal from community	0	1	1
Bad debts	1	0	1
Totals	157	79	236

Once again, intoxication is the charge most frequently found, accounting for almost exactly one-third of all accusations. There is this interesting difference from the churches previously studied; at Wheeley's, the vast majority of those charged with intoxication expressed sorrow for their conduct, gave the Church "satisfaction" and were forgiven and restored. Drunkenness was not as widespread as the figures might seem to indicate, for some individuals were charged with this single offense as many as eight or nine times before being finally excluded, sometimes for an entirely different offense. In all, forty individuals were charged with intoxication of whom thirteen were expelled. Taken together, these figures indicate a rather tolerant attitude toward the sin of drunkenness.

Anger and associated charges, such as fighting, assault, and personal abuse, account for forty-three accusations but only six expulsions. Closely connected with anger is the matter of personal quarrels and disputes, which involved twenty-three individuals (some of them "repeaters"), of whom three were excluded. Combining these two classifications, we find that a breakdown in personal relationships involved a total of sixty-four cases of which nine resulted in exclusion. This is an even larger total than for intoxication, and the excommunications were fewer.

Charges which resulted in almost certain exclusion, in addition to those involving sex, were gambling and non-attendance. Not counting the cases of "disorderly conduct," only seven cases involved sex, which is quite a contrast to Hepzibah, where sexual offenses account for almost one-fifth of the total.

A total of 218 cases were tried, 147 of them resulting in restoration, 71 in exclusion, for a rate of 33 per cent, by far the lowest yet found.

Shifting to the south but still in the lower Piedmont area, we shall next study the records of the Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church in eastern Chatham County.[136]

One of the cases in Mt. Pisgah that calls for extended comment is that of William Fuller. He was first tried for intoxication in February of 1833 and was forgiven and restored. In May of the same year he came forward at a church conference and pledged himself, with the aid of God, to refrain from the use of ardent spirits in the future, and was forgiven on another charge of intoxication. Apparently the pledge did not prove very effective, for in June he was back, and again was forgiven. Then his record improved, and in April, 1836, he extended his pledge to include wine and cider. He was not charged again until June of 1844, when he was again forgiven for intoxication. By that time, the patience of the Church was wearing thin, and the following month he was excluded for "habitual intoxication," and a committee was appointed to visit him and secure the Church records, for he was the Clerk.[137]

---

[136] Mt. Pisgah Church, Minutes, passim. See Appendix IV, 328-331.

Another member who had a much shorter record was Milly Cole who was excommunicated for "coming to the meeting house intemperate."[138]

A total of twenty-six charges involving ninety-five incidents are to be found in the Mt. Pisgah records during the period under study. Distribution is as follows:

Charge	Restored	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	16	18	34
Non-attendance	1	6	7
Pregnancy	0	6	6
Dancing	1	4	5
Quarrels	0	4	4
Slander	0	3	3
Disorderly conduct	1	2	3
Bastardy	0	3	3
Profanity	0	3	3
Lying	0	2	2
Adultery	0	2	2
Removal from community	0	2	2
Fornication before Marriage	0	2	2
Selling liquor	1	1	2
Anger	0	1	1
Contempt of the Church	0	1	1
Shooting a woman	0	1	1
Desertion of family	0	1	1
Wife-beating	0	1	1
Gambling	0	1	1
Fighting	1	0	1
Theft	0	1	1
Neglect of church duties	0	1	1
Leaving church conference	0	1	1
Playing cards	0	1	1
Totals	21	74	95

---

[137] Ibid., February, March, May, 1833, April 1836, June and July, 1844.

[138] Ibid., October, 1831.

It will be noted that not only does intoxication again lead the list, but that nearly all the instances of restoration were for this offense. Another feature is that of the twelve sexual offenses, ten involved pregnancy, the other two being for adultery; for the first time in this study, there is not a single trial for fornication as such. Perhaps because of this restriction of disciplinary action to cases in which guilt was obvious, fifteen per cent of all expulsions were for offences in the general area of sex. Again, in sharp contrast to Wheeley's Church, there are few cases involving personal conflict, two cases with family quarrels and one case each of fighting, anger and shooting a woman.

Of the eighty-four persons who were tried, eighteen were restored and sixty-five were excluded for an exclusion rate of seventy per cent, which is about the average except for Wheeley's Church.

The next Church to be examined is the Jersey Baptist Church,[139] located in Davidson County in the western foothills. Perhaps the most unusual feature of the disciplinary activity of Jersey Church is the fact that six quarrels among the members were settled through church action. Another unusual feature is the fact that in six cases the persons involved were suspended from fellowship for a time; the Raleigh Church used suspension, but not so extensively in proportion to the number of cases recorded. Eighteen of the cases involve Negroes, ten of them in the short period of 1836-1839.

---

[139] Jersey Baptist Meeting House, Record, Vol. I, 1794-1852, (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), passim. See Appendix IV, 331-334.

A total of eighty-five charges were made during the period under study, distributed as follows:

Charge	Restored	Suspended	Excluded	Total
Quarrels	12	2	2	16
Intoxication	6	1	7	14
Adultery	1	0	10	11
Immorality	0	0	9	9
Fornication	0	0	7	7
Theft	0	0	3	6
Slander	2	0	1	3
Disobedience to church	0	3	3	3
Lying	0	0	2	2
Dancing	0	0	2	2
Bastardy	0	0	2	2
Leaving husband	0	0	1	1
Non-attendance	0	0	1	1
Debts	1	0	0	1
Profanity	0	0	1	1
Leaving church meeting	0	0	1	1
Disorder	0	0	1	1
False charges	0	0	1	1
False testimony	0	0	1	1
Joining another church	0	0	1	1
Concealing stolen goods	0	1	0	1
Totals	22	7	56	85

For the first time in this study, intoxication took second place in terms of frequency, falling behind quarrels. As usual, however, it provided the bulk of the instances of restoration, if the settled quarrels are omitted. If all the sexual charges are combined into a single category, it is by far the largest with twenty-nine, thus accounting for more than one-third of the total; further, all but one of this general category were excluded, which accounts for exactly half of all excommunications. These were by far the highest percentages for this type of offense yet found.

The last two Churches to be studied in detail are located in the mountains. The first of these is the Island Ford Baptist Church, which is located in western Yadkin County.[140]

Although the number of cases in the Island Ford Church was comparatively small (53), several of them call for special comment. Of the ten instances of restoration, five concerned a single man, Cornelius Woodruff. On his first appearance, April, 1853, he requested the Church to remove him from his position as a deacon; however, the Church dismissed the charge against him and thus removed the basis for his request. He was forgiven and restored four more times before he was finally expelled. Eventually he was re-admitted, but in 1851 a committee visited him in regards to his drinking and reported that he did not like the principles of the church; accordingly, he was expelled again, this time, not for drunkenness but for "contempt of the Church."[141]

---

[140] Island Ford Church, Minutes, passim. See Appendix IV, 334-336.

[141] Ibid., April, 1833, April 1834, March 1837, January 1838, June 1839, February 1840, 6 September, 1851.

Mention might be made here of the frequency with which that phrase, "contempt," appeared in these records. Usually it involved the refusal of an accused person to appear at a church conference in answer to a citation to explain his or her conduct. Similar allied offenses included "disorder in church," "intoxication at Church Conference," and possibly "own request." All of these reflected a strong feeling among the membership against the activities and doctrines of the Church; this impression was strengthened when the cases of William Bryan, a local preacher, and his family were included, all of whom were expelled for belief in the practice of open communion.[142]

Perhaps the most unusal case noted in the entire study is that of Mark May, pastor of the Island Ford Church, who was expelled in January 1849 on a charge of fornication. Two brethren were appointed to demand his ministerial credentials which he had promised he would surrender.[143] This is the only instance of charges against a minister found in this entire search.

The fifty-three trials involved a total of fifty-four charges, distributed as indicated below:

---

[142] Ibid., May 1848 and January 1849.

[143] Ibid., 6 January 1849.

Charge	Restored	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	6	4	10
Contempt of the Church	1	6	7
Quarrels	2	2	4
Non-attendance	0	4	4
Open communion	0	4	4
Pregnancy	0	4	4
Anger	3	0	3
Disorderly conduct	0	3	3
Disorder in Church	0	2	2
Theft	0	2	2
Uncleanness	0	1	1
Non-fellowship	0	1	1
Assault	0	1	1
Profanity	1	0	1
Slander	0	1	1
Non-fulfillment of contract	0	1	1
Fornication	0	1	1
"own request"	0	1	1
Hostility	0	1	1
Joining another church	0	1	1
Not stated	0	1	1
Totals	13	41	54

The most unusual feature revealed by this tabulation has already been mentioned, the prominence of "contempt of the Church" and related charges. Another was the relative infrequency of accusations involving personal relationships; there are none for fighting, only four for quarrels and one for hostility. Sexual offenses were also few in number, four pregnancies, one fornication (Mark May), and no adulteries or bastardies; once again, action apparently was taken only in the most obvious cases. Charges levied in the area of sex were less than one-tenth of the total, as against one-third in the Jersey Church.

Of the fifty-three persons tried, thirteen were restored, one suspended and thirty-nine were excluded for an exclusion rate of seventy-four per cent.

The last Church to be given detailed examination is the Three Forks Baptist Church, located in Wilkes County.[144] Three Forks not only had many more breaches of discipline and a much wider range of charges than Island Ford, but also a number of quite unusual charges.

For example, John Rice, as a deacon, received and disbursed church funds, for which he was to make an annual accounting. Despite repeated requests, he refused to submit his records for examination; finally, he was excommunicated in April of 1805 as an "unruly member." His wife supported his action, and got the same treatment.[145]

Another unusual piece of administration concerned Thomas Shearer, charged in September 1842 with adultery. In October, he was unable to defend his actions satisfactorily, but the case was held over until the following month, when a large number of witnesses were heard. The Church was still unable to come to a decision in the case; accordingly it was decided to ask three neighboring churches to provide three men each to constitute a special committee with power to act in the name of the Church. Shearer was expelled.[146]

---

[144] Three Forks Baptist Church, Minutes, 1790-1895 (Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.), _passim_. See Appendix IV, 336-341.

[145] _Ibid._, April, [1805].

A case with a somewhat surprising outcome was that of Sally Thompson, accused of having her child sprinkled. Her defense was that the action had been strongly urged by both pairs of aged grandparents. She further stated that she knew that it would do the child no good, but also felt that it would not do any harm. The church apparently appreciated her position, for it decided that her action was not a bar to fellowship and she was continued in membership.[147]

This was one of several cases involving family relationships. Brother "Pain" was cited to explain why his children were "so naked." He apparently was able to defend himself, for no action was taken against him.[148] Sister Clawson was not so fortunate; she was excommunicated for beating her son.[149] In a similar case, Reuben Hartly was expelled for ill-treating his family in such a way as to "wound the good cause of the Church."[150]

The church not only concerned itself with family life but it also gave attention to the social relationships of its unmarried members. As an example, Patty Owens had requested a certain young man to meet her at the time of an evening service. He did so, and they spent the entire time of public worship together, away from the church. She was excommunicated.[151]

---

[146] Ibid., September, October, November, December, 1842.

[147] Ibid., March and April, 1843.

[148] Ibid., December [1802] and March, [1803].

[149] Ibid., July 1832.

[150] Ibid., January 1835.

A more serious situation apparently involved a brother and sister "double date" that got out of hand: William Gragg, Jimmy Regans, Susan Gragg and Fanny Regans were accused together of "scandalous conduct." The whole matter was placed in the hands of a committee with power to act. Gragg was found guilty of "unbecoming and base behavior," Regans of "making heavy threats;" both men were excommunicated, but the women were acquitted. Ragans was restored to membership a month later.[152]

Mention was made earlier in this chapter of the problems that arose over membership in the Order of the Sons of Temperance. In May 1852 the Three Forks Church voted that it did not approve of its members joining the Sons but laid the matter over until after the next meeting of the Association.[153] No further mention was made of any action regarding the resolution, but in the following year Damascus Hodges and Burton Hodges were cited for joining the Order. They refused to appear in response to the citation and were excluded.[154]

---

[151] Ibid., March [1802].

[152] Ibid., July, August, 1838.

[153] Ibid., May, 1852.

Earlier, two members, John Brown and James Profitt, had been excommunicated for joining the Free Masons.[155]

A unique situation developed regarding participating in political and militia affairs. In January, 1818, Brother Hartly was accused of accepting a commission as a Lieutenant in the militia without having first obtained the permission of the Church. He was able to make his apologies and remain in membership.[156] Two other brethren were more careful; William Greene got permission to serve as justice of the peace,[157] and L. Hodges was given liberty to accept appointment as a magistrate.[158]

Possibly the most unusual case of all is that of Jeremiah Greene. He made application for letters of dismissal for himself and his wife to join another church. The letters were refused on the ground that he permitted his daughter to "go around" with a married man. A committee was appointed to consider the matter. Its report was that the conduct of the Greenes was such as to debar them from receiving letters of dismissal but that when they should bar their daughter from "the common priviledges of their house with a suitable confession to the Church they be reconciled and have their letter." The report was accepted, but unfortunately the records do not indicate whether the Greenes complied.[159]

---

[154] Ibid., January, April, 1853.

[155] Ibid., July, August 1802, May, June, 1807.

[156] Ibid., January, March 1818.

[157] Ibid., November 1833.

[158] Ibid., July 1851.

Analysis of the cases from the Three Forks Church indicates that a total of 123 trials were held involving 135 charges, which were distributed as follows: (See next page)

---

[159] *Ibid.*, August, 1811.

Charge	Restored	Excluded	Total
Intoxication	27	17	44
Contempt of the Church	0	11	11
Fornication	0	10	10
Profanity and blasphemy	3	7	10
Non-attendance	1	8	9
Anger	6	1	7
Dancing	2	4	6
Scandalous conduct	2	2	4
Lying	1	3	4
Abuse of family	2	2	4
Joining the Masons	0	2	2
Refusal to account for church funds	0	2	2
Cheating in business	0	2	2
Fighting	0	2	2
Joining the Sons of Temperance	0	2	2
Quarrel	0	1	1
Refusal of debt	0	1	1
Failure to use letter of dismissal	0	1	1
Fraud	0	1	1
Filthy conduct	0	1	1
Joining another church	0	1	1
Hostility	0	1	1
"Dallying at time of Church Service"	0	1	1
Pregnancy	0	1	1
Permitting daughter to commit adultery	0	1	1
Slander	0	1	1
Unwise talk	0	1	1
Accepted militia commission without consent of Church	1	0	1
Theft	0	1	1
Attempted fraud	1	0	1
Non-fellowship	0	1	1
Assault	0	1	1
Sabbath-breaking	1	0	1
Adultery	0	1	1
Having child sprinkled	1	0	1
Totals	48	87	135

It will be noted that as usual intoxication heads the list both of charges and exclusions, even though well over half of those thus accused made satisfactory profession of repentence and were restored to fellowship and membership. Many of those expelled on a charge of intoxication were also involved in other accusations, especially "contempt of the Church," which in turn, was the second most common offense. Only twelve cases involve sexual misdeeds and eleven are concerned with personal relationships, such as anger, fighting and hostility. Profanity and blasphemy are more significant here than has been usually true. The remaining charges ranged over a wide variety of offenses with but few cases in any category.

Of the 123 members tried, 49 were restored or acquitted and 74 were expelled for an exclusion rate of 60 per cent. As was true in Island Ford, this is below the usual average.

Consolidation of all the charges preferred in the nine churches given intensive study reveals that there are twenty-seven accusations which appeared at least six times and thus justify further examination.[160]

---

[160] Charges which were made five or fewer times are not considered to be of sufficient importance to justify further examination. Their frequency and identification are as follows:

Five cases each--concealing stolen goods, fraud.

Four each--disobedience to masters, removal without taking a letter of dismissal, playing cards, neglect of church duties, cause not stated.

Three each--bigamy, slave-trade, libel, suits at law against members, visiting or keeping house of ill fame.

Two each--attending a circus, debts, mistreating slaves, lewdness, criminal visits, attempt to establish

The following table lists the major charges in the order of their frequency, giving the number of persons not excluded for one reason or another, the number excluded, total number involved and the percentage of exclusion.

Charge	Not excluded	Excluded	Total	Per Cent
Intoxication	156	141	197	47
Fornication	10	62	72	87
Quarrels and disputes	36	12	48	25
Non-attendance	7	38	45	84
Theft	12	31	43	72
Adultery	8	33	41	92
Profanity and blasphemy	13	28	41	68
Anger	33	4	37	11
Dancing	10	26	36	72
Disorderly conduct	9	26	35	75
Fighting	17	13	30	43
Traffic in liquor	7	21	28	75
Contempt of the Church	1	23	24	96
Abuse or desertion of family	5	8	13	72
Pregnancy while unmarried	0	13	13	100
Immorality	0	12	12	100
Joining another church	0	11	11	100
Assault	3	5	8	63
Slaves running away	3	4	7	59
Gambling	1	5	6	83
Undue familiarity	2	4	6	67
Sabbath-breaking	5	1	6	16
Bastardy	0	6	6	100
Gross immorality	2	4	6	67
Open communion	1	5	6	83
Hostility	2	4	6	67
Totals	353	472	825	57

---

as alibi, abortion, having child sprinkled, improper language, illegal reception into memberhip, joining the Free Masons, joining the Sons of Temperance, attending a meeting for pleasure.

One each--perjury, preaching without permission, sheltering a runaway, chasing Negro women at night, murder, trespass, forgery, breaking up a marriage, horse-trading, false accounts, damaging property of another, giving a military book to a slave, horse-racing, cock-fighting, false charges, false testimony, non-fulfillment of contract, abetting adultery, accepting a militia commission without consent of the Church.

It will be noted that on four charges (immorality, pregnancy while unmarried, joining another church and bastardy), expulsion was universal. At the other extreme, only forty-seven per cent of those accused of intoxication were expelled, and only eleven per cent of those charged with anger. An interesting fact is that only four of the seven slaves charged with running away were excluded, while three were forgiven and restored. The over-all expulsion rate for these most common offenses is fifty-seven per cent. Excommunication was much more common in the area of sexual misconduct, where the rate was eighty-seven per cent.

Consolidation of the figures for individual churches is as follows:

Church	Not excluded	Excluded	Total	Per cent
Red Bank	11	40	51	80
Fayetteville	18	53	71	75
Hepzibah	45	178	223	79
Raleigh	16	39	55	79
Wheeley's	147	71	218	33
Mt. Pisgah	19	65	84	77
Jersey	29	56	85	66
Island Ford	14	39	53	74
Three Forks	49	74	123	60
Totals	348	615	963	66

It is thus seen that six of the nine churches surveyed expelled three-fourths or more of the members whom they tried, while in contrast Wheeley's excluded only one-third, largely due to tolerance of intoxication. The over-all average was just under two-thirds.

Examination of the disciplinary experience of this sample of North Carolina Baptist churches indicates that while in their official documents most congregations placed at least major emphasis on the sins which were capable of barring the offender from Heaven, in practice they included many offenses which placed the church and its membership in an unfavorable light in the community. In many instances, a major concern was the maintainance of peace and harmony within the church membership. Most church conferences opened with worship, after which the question was asked, "Are all members present in fellowship and love?" Those who were sat down, those who had a grievance against any member remained standing. Immediate action was taken to restore fellowship through reconciliation or the initiation of trial procedures.

Trial procedures were designed to protect both the church and the accused. If the matter were a personal quarrel, a leading member or a committee was appointed to attempt to effect a reconciliation. If the accused were absent, a member or committee was chosen to notify him of the accusation against him and to cite him to appear at the next conference meeting, usually one month hence. Cases were frequently carried forward for months to give the accused every chance to defend himself or to plead guilty, profess penitence and promise amendment. The latter course was most frequently followed in charges of intoxication, anger and fighting. In some churches, especially Wheeley's and Three Forks, drunkenness almost needed to be habitual before the church resorted to exclusion. The only offense for which both confession and defense were ruled out was adultery, and even this practice was not universal, as we have seen that one person out of six charged with an offense in the matter of sex was not expelled. If a case proved especially difficult to decide, help might be sought from neighboring churches, but no system of appeal to the association or the State Convention was provided. Penalty was normally restricted to excommunication, but in some few cases in particular churches, suspension from the priviledges of membership for a specified period of time was imposed. Expulsion from the church could mean complete social ostracism from the remaining members.

The three most common categories of cases were intoxication, sex offenses and instances of personal hostility and friction. Only in sexual offenses were a majority of the accused actually expelled. Perhaps the possibility of being in the position of the accused at a future trial made members more lenient and ready to forgive.

One final phase of church discipline among the Baptists remains to be explored, namely, the extent to which members were expelled from fellowship. To accomplish this purpose, the Minutes of twelve associations were examined and pertinent information was extracted.[161] The selected associations are distributed across the State and include nearly all of those whose records are available for a substantial portion of the period under study. Taken together they provide an adequate sample. In the tabulation for each association, the first column indicates the year in which data was presented to the annual session, the second the number of churches belonging to the association, the third and the fourth the number excluded and total membership, respectively. Data is displayed in groups representing decades, and the figures to the right of decade totals indicate the average annual number of exclusions, average membership and the annual exclusion rate which is the percentage of members excluded each year during the particular decade. The final page of the Appendix consolidates the exclusion rates, per decade, for each of the associations studied.

A few general observations are possible. In the first place, by and large, exclusion rates in the Piedmont associations (Beulah, Flat River, Liberty, Raleigh, Sandy Creek and Tar River), are lower than those in either the coastal or mountain areas. Secondly, there is no consistent trend in either increase or decrease in rated during the period studied. The closest approach to a pattern is high rates during the decade of the 1830's, which may reflect the controversy over missions which agitated North Carolina Baptists during that period. A third observation is that over half of the exclusion rates are included within the range 1.40-2.70. Only one rate exceeded 2.70, namely that of Tuckasiege Association in the 1830's, but this represents a single year in a small association (276 members) and thus is not conclusive. All the remaining rates are below 1.40, ranging as low as 0.77. The median point is 1.43. In other words, over the entire period studied, State-wide, a little under 1.5 per cent of the membership were excluded from fellowship each year.

---

[161] See Appendix V, 342-354. Years which are not included in tabulations are those for which pertinent information is not available, usually because of incompleteness of the collections from which microfilms were prepared. In some cases, Minutes did not include statistical information, due to mutilation of the printed pamphlets.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

All of the three denominational groups studied, the Society of Friends, the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Baptist Churches, sought diligently to keep their membership unspotted from the sins of the world by the establishment of definite standards of conduct and the expulsion from membership of those who were unwilling or unable to conform. In all three groups, excommunication was the main if not the only form of punishment available and thus was considered as a last resort to be employed only when persuasion failed.

Because of their more formal systems of organization, the Quakers and the Methodists developed much more comprehensive and precise codes of conduct than the highly individualistic Baptists. All three groups based their disciplinary standards and procedures upon Scriptural concepts, especially those found in Matthew 18:15-17 and Galatians 5:19-21, which dealt with settlement of personal grievances and the deadly sins, respectively. At the same time, all the groups exercised the function of judicial interpretation to determine the meaning of the scriptural injunctions as applied to the personal, moral, economic and social problems of the day. In this way, they sought to expand and make more effective the Biblical standards without laying themselves open to the charge of legislating for Christ and of imposing requirements upon their members which had no scriptural foundation. This was less of a problem for the Society of Friends with its doctrine of the Inner Light and the concept of continual revelation.

Sharp variations appear, especially between the Quakers and the Baptists, in the type of offenses which were the most common. Among the Society of Friends, eighty per cent of all disownments for which the cause was indicated were directly connected with marriage, only six cases were for quarrels or disputes and none for sexual offenses, intoxication or the selling of liquor. This concentration of attention on marriage with outsiders reflects a determination on the part of the Society of Friends to keep itself clear of any intimate personal involvement with the secular community. In contrast, among the Baptists, there were no expulsions in connection with marriage, but out of 615 cases in the 9 selected Churches, 141 were for intoxication, 130 for sexual offenses, 12 for quarrels and disputes, 21 for traffic in liquor (largely in Fayetteville), 28 for profanity and blasphemy. These figures reflect the close involvement of the membership of the Baptist churches with the general community life.

It may well be that in all three groups the anxiety to keep their membership pure in personal life betrayed a sense of insecurity. None of these groups included many of the political, social and economic leaders of the community; in fact, as noted earlier, the Society of Friends, with its prohibition of participation in partisan politics, was about as far out of the governmental power structure as it could well get. As a result, all three groups feared the evil influence of the community and thus sought to withdraw from close involvement in the civil life. In a sense, all of them sought to be in the community of the world and yet not of it. Especially among the Methodists and Baptists, this involved a definite ambivalence which is reflected by the use of such phrases as "reports being in the world" and "worldlings," and the occasional prohibition of accepting public office without the prior consent of the church.

Among both the Baptists and the Quakers, expulsion was a major cause of membership loss. During the period under study, Quaker disownments totalled 4,314, while in the 9 selected Baptist Churches, a total of 615 were expelled, and in the 12 associations studied, 7,806 were excommunicated. These figures become even more significant when it is recalled that most records are incomplete or do not cover the entire period. Lack of definite information concerning membership in the Society of Friends makes percentage figures impossible but study of associational Minutes indicates that loss to excommunication averaged close to 1 1/2 per cent, and usually was a more important source of loss than death itself.

Accepted standards of conduct were relatively stable throughout the period studied. In the Society of Friends, the major changes in the Discipline involved problems arising from the massive migration to the Mid-West. The Methodists found it necessary to adjust to the changing attitudes regarding slavery and solved their problem largely by treating slavery purely as a civil institution outside the concern of the Church. The Baptists were increasingly concerned over the beverage use of alcohol as reflected in the resolutions of associations tending toward total abstinence and an increasing readiness of local churches to expel for intoxication. On the whole, however, all three groups tended to use church discipline to maintain standards of conduct developed by previous generations. Basically, then, church discipline was essentially a conservative factor in the life of the three denominations surveyed in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Society of Friends

Primary Materials

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North Carolina, from the 30th of the 10th to the 3rd of the 11th Month, Inclusive, 1809*. Raleigh, N.C.: Thomas Henderson, 1809.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, from the 4th to the 7th of the 11th month, inclusive, 1822*. Hillsborough, N.C.: Printed by Dennis Heartt, 1823.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, from 7th to the 11th of the 11th Month, inclusive, 1836*. Jamestown, N.C.: J. Stanton, Pr., 1837.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, N.C. in the Eleventh Month, 1854*. Greensboro, N.C.: Printed by the Patriot Press, 1855.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *From the Meeting of Sufferings*. Greensboro, N.C.: Printed by William Swain, 1831.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *A Memorial to the General Assembly of North Carolina*. N. P., N. P., N. D. [1832?].

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *Minutes of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1848-1861*. Various publishers. This item consists of bound copies of annual minutes.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting. *Names, Times and Places of Holding North Carolina Yearly Meetings and the Meetings that Constitute the Same*. Jamestown, N.C.: J. Sherwood, Printer, *1845*.

Friends, Society of, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *A Narrative of Some of the Proceedings of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting on the Subject of Slavery within Its Limits. Published by Order of the Meeting for Sufferings of the North Carolina Yearly Meeting*. Greensborough, N.C.: Printed by Swaim and Sherwood, 1848.

Friends, Society of, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, *Rules of Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends Held in Philadelphia. Printed by Order of the Meeting, Philadelphia*: Printed by Kimber, Conrad & Co., 1806.

General Assembly of North Carolina, *Acts Passed by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1830-31*. Raleigh, N.C.: Lawrence and Lemay, Printers to the Senate, 1831.

General Assembly of North Carolina, *Acts Passed by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1832-33.* Raleigh, N.C.: Charles R. Ramsey, Printer to the Senate, 1833.

Hinshaw, William Wade, *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Geneology*, *Vol*. *I*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1936.

North Carolina Manumission Society, *Constitution of the Manumission Society of North Carolina*. [N. P., N. D.] "Ratified in general Association, held at Deep River Meeting House, in Guilford County the 11th of October, 1824."

Manumission Society Papers. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Robert & Newton D. Woody Papers. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Secondary Materials.

Anscombe, Francis Charles, *I Have Called You Friends: The Story of Quakerism in North Carolina*. Boston: *The Christopher Publishing House, 1959*.

Brinton, Anna, Ed., Then and Now: Quaker Essays, Historical and Contemporary. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.

Boorstin, Daniel J., The Americans: The Colonial Experience. New York: Random House, 1959.

Cadbury, Henry Joel, The Church in The Wilderness: North Carolina Quakerism as Seen by Visitors. [Guilford College, N.C.] North Carolina Friends' Historical Society, [1948?]

Cartland, Fernando G., Southern Heroes, or the Friends in War Time. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1895.

Drake, Thomas E., Quakers and Slavery in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Evans, Thomas, A Concise Account of the Religious Society of Friends commonly Called Quakers, Embracing a Sketch of Their Christian Doctrines and Practices. Reprinted by the Authority of the Meeting for Sufferings, Philadelphia: [N. P., N. D.]

Gilbert, Dorothy Lloyd, First Friends in New Garden in North Carolina. Guilford College: Friends' Historical Association, 1945.

Hawarth, Sara Richardson, Springfield, 1773-1940. [High Point, N. C.: Barber-Hall Printing Company, 1940.]

Hobbs, Mary Mendenhall, "Nathan Hunt and His Times." Bulletin of Friends Historical Society of Philadelphia, I (Nov. 1907), 91-112.

Jones, Rufus, The Later Years of Quakerism, 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1921.

Littrell, Mary P., et. al., A History of Rich Square Monthly Meeting of Friends. Woodland, N. C.: N. P. [1960?].

Peele, Julianna, "The Founders of the Rich Square Meeting," An Annual Publication of Historical Papers, VII, 93-98. Durham, N.C.: Historical Society of Trinity College.

Russell, Elbert, The History of Quakerism. London: The Macmillan Co., Ltd., 1942.

Thomas, Allen C., *A History of the Friends in America.* 6th Edition. (Pennsbury Series of Modern Quaker Books). Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., 1930.

Weeks, Stephen B., *Southern Quakers and Slavery: A Study in Institutional History.* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Studies, extra volume XV). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1896.

The Methodist Episcopal Church

Primary Materials

Methodist Episcopal Church, General Conference, *Journal Of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1830-1844.* New York: G. Lane & C. B. Tippett, 1844.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, General Conference, *Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.* Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, *Journal, 1838-1849.* Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, *Journal, 1840-1848.* Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, *Journal, 1846-1866.* Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Washington District, Bath Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1849-1891. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Greensboro District, Caswell Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1844-1876. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Raleigh District, Chatham Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1833-1871. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Edenton Methodist Church, Record Book. Microfilm, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Western North Carolina Conference, Greensboro District, Guilford Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1832-1865. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Haw River Circuit, Church Book, 1841-1852. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Fayetteville District, Haw River Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1854-1887. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Virginia Conference, Suffolk [Yadkin] District, Iredell Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1823-1851. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Salisbury District, Iredell Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1852-1873. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Shelby District, Lincolnton and Rock Springs Circuit, Quarterly Conference Records, 1828-1876. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Virginia Conference, [Suffolk] District, Pasquotank Circuit, General Church Record, 1854-1858. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Carolina Conference, Fayetteville District, Rockingham Circuit, Quarterly Conference Minutes, 1845-1869. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Stokes Circuit, Quarterly Meeting Conference, Minutes, 1831-1856. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Virginia and North Carolina Conferences, Newbern and Neuse Districts, New River, Newport and Trent Circuit, Quarterly Conference, Minutes, 1815-1844. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Wilmington, N.C., Quarterly Reports, 1810-1852. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Bumpus Papers. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C. Contains approximately 150 items, including 16 volumes of diaries.

William Clark Doub Papers. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C. 333 items, 4 volumes. Included Peter Doub Diary, 1819-1834, multilith copy. Reflects conditions in Methodist rural churches of the period.

John Early Diary, May 1807-June 1814. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C. This is a copy, original in possession of Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. Early was a Methodist itinerant preacher in North Carolina in his early years, later became a Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church, first Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Duncan McLaurin Papers and Letters, 1817-1932. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C. 1847 items, 1 volume. Mostly business papers, but some reference to religious matters.

Mangum Papers. Series III, Adolphus W. Mangum Sermons and Diary. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C. Mangum was pastor of the Methodist Church, Chapel Hill, for a short time. Diary reflects his problems, especially quarrels within the membership. Materials include many sermon outlines, mostly doctrinal in nature.

Stephen B. Weeks Collection. Manuscript, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C. Most valuable item is the "Diary of Jeremiah Norman," a Methodist itinerant preacher in North Carolina in the early nineteenth century, who gives a vivid picture of the problems he faced in his ministry. Contains a few brief sermon outlines.

Ormond, William, Jr., Journal. Typescript copy, Library School of Religion, Duke University, Durham, N.C. Ormond was a Methodist Itinerant in North and South Carolina in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

John Young, Sr., Papers, 1784-1965. Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C. Young was a Methodist itinerant preacher in Oxford, Granville and Franklin counties, North Carolina. 8 items, 9 volumes of diaries.

Secondary Materials

Bascom, H. B., D. D., *Methodism and Slavery: with other Matters in Dispute between the North and the South, Being a Review of the Manifesto of the Majority in Reply to the Protest of the Minority of the Late General Conference of the Methodist E. Church, in the Case of Bishop Andrew.* Frankfort, Ken.: Hodges, Todd & Pruett, 1845.

Cox, Abrams Jones, "Opposition of the Methodist Circuit Riders to Prevelent American Vices." Unpublished B. D. Thesis, Duke University School of Religion, Durham, N.C.

Emory, Robert, *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. New York: G. Lane and C. B. Tippett, 1845.

Grissom, Henry Lee, *History of Methodism in North Carolina from 1772 to the Present Time*. Nashville, Tenn.: Publication House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905.

Lamb, Elizabeth, Compiler, *A Historical Sketch of the Hay Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Fayetteville, North Carolina*. [N. P., N. P.], 1934.

Lee, Leroy M., D. D., *The Life and Times of the Rev. Jesse Lee*. Charleston, S.C.: Published by John Early for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1848.

Peterson, P. A., D. D., *History of the Revisions of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1889.

Swaney, Charles Baumer, Episcopal Methodism and Slavery. Boston: Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press, 1926.

The Baptists

Primary Materials

Associational Minutes.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Beulah Baptist Association, Minutes, 1837-1959. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Briar Creek Association, Minutes, 1825-1929. Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Assocations, Cape Fear Association, Minutes, 1808-1898. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Catawba River Association, Minutes, 1827-1959. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Chowan Association, Minutes, 1806-1914. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Flat River Association, Minutes, 1811-1959. Microfilm by Baptist Sunday School Board, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, French Broad Association, Minutes, 1815-1959. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Goshen Association, Minutes, 1827-1843. Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Green River Baptist Association, Minutes, 1843-1964. Microfilm by North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Lewis Fork Association, Minutes, 1836-1879. Microfilm negative at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C. Positive copy, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Liberty Association, Minutes, 1832-1924. Microfilm by Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Raleigh Association, Minutes, 1826-1925. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Sandy Creek Association, Minutes, 1815-1914. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Tar River Association, Minutes, 1841-1925. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Three Forks Association, Minutes, 1841-1959. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Associations, Tuckasiege Association, Minutes, 1829-1866. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at North Carolina Room, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

North Carolina Baptist Association, Yadkin Association, Minutes, 1786-1959. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Baptist Churches.

Bear Creek Baptist Church, Records, 1802-1828. Microfilm, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Bethel Baptist Church, Minutes, 1806-1847. Microfilm, negative at Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, N.C., positive copy at North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Briar Creek Baptist Church, Minutes, 1783-1860. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Brown Creek Baptist Church, Records, 1840-1857. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Buckhorn Baptist Church, Minutes, 1835-1874. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

First Baptist Church, Clayton, Minutes, 1839-1863. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Cross Roads Baptist Church, Mocksville, Minutes, 1851-1890. North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

East Bend Baptist Church, Minutes, 1847-1886. 2 volumes. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

First Baptist Church, Fayetteville, Church Minutes, 1848-1870. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Flat Rock Baptist Church, Hamptonville, Minutes, 1783-1820. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Globe Baptist Church, Minutes, 1792-1911. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Hepzibah Baptist Church, Records, 1809-1925. 2 volumes. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Baptist Church, Hillsboro, Minutes, 1853-1946. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Island Ford Baptist Church, Minutes, 1809-1939. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Jersey Baptist Meeting House, Record, Vol. I, 1784-1852. (Typescript copy). Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Kenansville Baptist Church, Journal, Vol. I, 1837-1923. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Lee's Chapel Baptist Church, Minutes, 1825-1894. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Lufty Baptist Church, Minutes, 1836-1895. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Meddow Creek Baptist Church, Records, 1811-1881. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Mill River Baptist Church, Minutes, 1835-1862. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church, Minutes, 1814-1869. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Mt. Tabor Baptist Church, Minutes, 1839-1879. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

First Baptist Church, Raleigh, Minutes, 1812-1832, 1840-1856, 1856-1874. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Ramon [Ramoth] Gilead Baptist Church, Minutes, 1808-1881. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Red Bank Baptist Church, Minutes, 1791-1882. Microfilm, North Carolina commission of Archives and History Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Salem Baptist Church, Minute Book, 1803-1854. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Sandy Creek Baptist Church, Record Books 1773-1845. Microfilm, North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Sandy Springs Baptist Church, Minutes, 1841-1869. Microfilm, negative at Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, N.C. Copy at North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Siloam Baptist Church, Minutes, 1834-1876. [Minutes not available, 1837-1857]. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

South-west Baptist Church, Minutes, 1843-1892. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Three Forks Baptist Church, Minutes, 1790-1895. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Wake Forest Baptist Church, Minutes and Roll Book, 1835-1939. Microfilm by Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy in Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Wells Chapel Baptist Church, Minutes, 1803-1876. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Wheeley's [Wheeler's] Baptist Church, Minute Book, 1791-1898, 2 volumes. Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Wilmington Baptist Church, Minutes, vol. I, 1852-1871. Microfilm, North Carolina Commission of Archives and History, Division of Archives and Manuscripts, Raleigh, N.C.

Other Sources.

Benedict, David, *General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World*. Boston: Lincoln, 1813.

Lumpkin, William L., *Baptist Foundations in the South*. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1961.

Paschal, George Washington, "Morgan Edwards' "Materials toward a History of the Baptists in North Carolina'", *North Carolina Review*, VII (July 1930).

Paschal, George Washington, *History of North Carolina Baptists*. Raleigh, N.C.: The General Board, North Carolina Baptist Convention.

Sweet, William Warren, *Religion on the American Frontier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

APPENDIX I

The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved of by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden in Guilford County, North Carolina, from the 30th of the 10th to the 3rd of the 11th Month, Inclusive--1809. Raleigh: Thomas Henderson, Jun'r., 1809. (Hereafter cited as Discipline, NCYM, 1809).

APPEALS

Whilst the Yearly Meeting, in granting an Appeal, considers it as a precious priviledge, it is affectionately desired that all may be careful how they encourage persons of improper disposition to trouble superiour meetings therewith.

If any be dissatisfied with, or think themselves aggrieved by the judgement of a Monthly Meeting, they may, after a copy of the Testimony of Disownment is delivered to them, notify the first or second Monthly Meeting following, (but not after) of their intention of appealing to the ensuing Quarterly Meeting; which notification the Monthly Meeting should enter on minute, and appoint a committee to attend the Quarterly Meeting, with a copy of the proceedings relative to the case, signed by the clerk, there to show the reasons on which that judgement was founded; the Quarterly Meeting is then to refer the same to a Committee of Friends, omitting those of the Monthly Meeting from whence it came; and they are to confirm or reverse the judgement, as, on impartial examination, shall appear to be right; taking care to inform the appellant of the result.

If any appellant, on being informed of the judgement of a Quarterly Meeting, shall be dissatisfied therewith, he or she may notify that, or the next Quarterly

Meeting (but not after) of his or her intention of applying [sic] to the next Yearly Meeting for a rehearing: the said Quarterly Meeting, after recording such notification, is, in like manner to appoint a committee to attend the Yearly Meeting with copies of the records of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, in the case, signed by the clerks: here it is to be finally determined, and a copy of the determination sent to the Quarterly Meeting from whence the appeal came, and from thence to the Monthly Meeting. Notices of appeals are to be forwarded from subordinate to superiour meetings, in the regular reports of such meetings.

It is our earnest solicitude that Friends may maintain the discipline of the Church, in the spirit of the Gospel, which breathes "Peace on earth and good will to men." Under the influence of this they will be favored with wisdom prudently to determine the affairs of Society; and thereby be more likely to prevent appeals coming to the Yearly Meeting, which besides tending to prolong it, sometimes occasion uneasiness to the body.[1]

[The following was inserted at the end of the second paragraph in 1822: *except they find that the case had not been acted on in monthly meeting according to discipline; and if so, it is to be returned to the monthly meeting of such proceedings for reexamination*; taking care to inform the appellant of the result.[2]

[The following phrase was added to the first sentence of the second paragraph in 1836: *or Left at their dwelling*.][3]

---

[1] *Discipline*, *NCYM 1809*, pp. 3, 4.

[2] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North Carolina, from the 4th to the 7th of the 11th Month, Inclusive, 1822*. Hillsborough [No. Car.]: Dennis Heartt, 1823, pp. 5, 6. (Hereafter cited as *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1822*).

[3] Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, *The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, North Carolina, from the 7th to the 11th of the 11th Month, Inclusive, 1836*, p. 14. Jamestown, [No. Car.], 1837. (Hereafter cited as *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1836*.

ARBITRATIONS

When differences arise between our members in regard to their property, they are to proceed in the following manner:--the party who thinks himself or herself aggrieved, should, in the first place, calmly and kindly request the other to comply with the demand; and if this be refused, the complaintant himself or agent (if residing at too great a distance) should take with him one or two of the Overseers, or other discreet friends, and in their presence, repeat the demand.

If this step also fail, and the matter appear a plain account or bond, against which no reasonable objection is made, the party complained of should be advised to settle it without further trouble: but if there appear difficulty in the matter under dispute, or unsettled difference in accounts, or other reasonable objections, the parties should be advised to choose a suitable number of Friends as Arbitrators, and mutually engage, by bond or other written instrument adapted to the occasion, to abide by their determination.

Should the proposal be acceeded to, the Arbitrators ought, as speedily as circumstances will admit, to appoint a time and place and attend to the business without unnecessary delay; giving the parties a fair and full hearing, in the presence of each other--but listening to neither of them apart, nor suffering their own sentiments to be known abroad till they have fully digested the subject, and come to a clear decision; which they should be careful to do within the time agreed on.

But if either of the parties refuse the counsel of Friends in the matter under dispute; or when arbitrators are chosen, neglect to give his or her attendence when desired, without assigning sufficient reason, or not abide by their award when issued; in either of these cases the person so offending shall be complained of to the monthly meeting of which he or she is a member: and if the brotherly endeavours and admonitions of the Society in this capacity fail to produce a conformity to justice in the case, the meeting shall proceed to disown the offender, unless such person make it evident the award or proceedings have been erroneous or unjust; in which case the matter in dispute may be referred to the same or other arbitrators, as the meeting shall judge best, and their award shall be final. After which, if either of the parties prove so regardless of peace and unity, as not to acquiesce in such confirmed or corrected determination, the Monthly Meeting to which he or she belongs shall proceed to issue a testimony against the person so refusing.

That arbitrators may better answer the end of their appointment, and be helpful in conciliating the minds of the parties, they ought not to consider themselves as advocates for those by whom they were chosen; but as men whose duty it is to 'judge righteously, fearing the Lord.' They should shun all previous information respecting the case; or having heard anything of it, remain, as much as possible, unbiased thereby. They should reject no evidence, nor receive any, but in the presence of both parties. And in their award they need not assign any reason for their determination.

And whereas, there may be some circumstances, even in disputed matters, wherein the foregoing equitable mode of proceeding cannot be complied with: such as the party absconding, or leaving the country with design to defraud his or her creditors: or apparent danger of bankruptcy, and other creditors generally coming on, which would occasion damage to the claimant, by the time it would take to pursue the above method: or where there may be danger of future damage, as in the case of Executors, Administrators, Trustees and Legatees: it may, therefor, be necessary, and is directed that monthly meetings, when such cases happen, as shall, in the first two mentioned cases in this paragraph, appear to them as really necessitated to proceed to law: and in the case of Executors, Administrators, Trustees and Legatees, where it shall appear to the meeting that the matter is of importance, and that our friendly way may be unsafe, such may be permitted to have the matter tried at law: also in cases concerning the titles of land, with this caution, 'that the parties on both sides behave towards each other in brotherly love, decency and moderation,' which will be a becoming testimony in courts, and show that nothing but the nature of the case and our station, in common with others under the law of the land, take any of us there.

As it may sometimes occur that a member, either for want of a clear understanding of the business, or through improper influence, may present a complaint against another, wherein the Overseers, after fully hearing both parties, being decidedly of the opinion that the case does not require a reference, they are to advise a speedy settlement of it; which being ineffectual, and the complaintant remaining dissatisfied, he may have liberty to inform the Preparative Meeting, where the other is a member, without mentioning any name, that 'having a matter in dispute with one of their members, he is desirous of their assistance in settling it:' the said meeting is then to appoint a judicious committee to enquire into the propriety of leaving the matter to arbitration: if they judge the complaint ought to be referred, they are to advise that it be submitted accordingly: but if they concur in judgement with the Overseers, the complaint is to be dismissed.

If any Preparative Meeting think any matter too weighty or inconvenient for them to manage, they may move it to the Monthly Meeting, which is to proceed in the same manner as directed to preparative meetings.

It is the advice of the Yearly Meeting, that our members who differ on account of worldly affairs, do avoid, so much as possible, choosing Friends in the Ministry as arbitrators.

Persons not in membership with us may have difference with any of our members settled in our way, by coming under the same restrictions.[4]

[In 1822, the last paragraph was deleted.][5]

BIRTHS AND BURIALS

As inconvenience may arise from want of due attention in deeping regular records of births and deaths, it is enjoined upon each Monthly Meeting to appoint a careful friend, whose duty it shall be to keep, in a book provided at the expense of the Monthly Meeting, for that purpose, a record of all Marriage, Certificates, Births and Deaths within its limits, which shall be offered to him for that purpose.

Friends are also enjoined to maintain our testimony against affixing superfluous monuments of any description to graves; and if any are placed thereat, they be forthwith removed; and that they avoid the custom of wearing or giving mourning habits, and all extravagant expences on account of the dead.[6]

[In 1854, the following was added at the end of the first paragraph: _And Monthly Meetings are required to appoint a committee once a year, to see that such records are made, and report to the Monthly Meeting_.][7]

BOOKS

It is the sense of the Yearly Meeting that no member of our Society shall print or publish any book or writing, having a tendency to excite disunity or discord, nor on any religious subject, without the perusal and approbation of such friends as shall be appointed for that purpose; and if any shall print or publish any book, or writing, without consent of such a committee, he or they are to be complained of to the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, and unless they condemn the same to the satisfaction of said meeting, to be testified against.[8]

---

[4] _Discipline, NCYM 1809_, pp. 4-7.

[5] _Discipline, NCYM 1822_, p. 9.

[6] _Discipline, NCYM 1809_, p. 7.

[7] The Society of Friends, North Carolina Yearly Meeting, _The Discipline of Friends, Revised and Approved by the Yearly Meeting, Held at New Garden, in Guilford County, N.C., in the Eleventh Month, 1854_. Greensboro, N.C.: The Patriot Office, 1854, p. 13. (Hereafter cited as _Discipline, NCYM 1854_).

[In 1822, disowned was substituted for testified against at the end of the paragraph.][9]

CERTIFICATES

When Friends are about to remove from one Monthly Meeting to another, they ought to apply to the Monthly Meeting to which they belong for a Certificate of their membership; and such Meeting, if nothing appear to obstruct it, ought to grant such applicant a Certificate setting forth their right of membership, directed to the Monthly Meeting within the limits of which they are going to reside.

If any in profession with us remove without first applying for a certificate, and have not otherwise misbehaved, the Monthly Meeting shall send one to the Monthly Meeting within the limits of which he or she may reside, certifying their right of membership.

All Certificates of removal, prepared for Women Friends, after being considered in their meeting, are to be sent to the men's, and if there approved, signed by both clerks. When Apprentices or persons under age are under necessity of going from one place to another, their parents or guardians, masters or mistresses, should apply for certificates for them, recommending them to the care and oversight of the Monthly Meeting whereto they remove.

When approved Ministers remove from one Monthly Meeting to another, they are to have certificates setting forth their station, and the unity Friends have with them therein. But when Elders remove, they have not a right to a Certificate of their Eldership, but only as other members.[10]

---

[8] Discipline, NCYM 1809, p. 8.

[9] Discipline, NCYM 1822, p. 9.

[10] Discipline, NCYM, 1809, pp. 8, 9.

[The following was added to the first paragraph in 1822: *And when a person receives a certificate of removal, if it be not accepted by the Monthly Meeting to which it is directed, nor returned by the individual as a resident, within twelve months from the date thereof, the monthly meeting which granted the certificate may disown such, unless satisfactory reason be given.*

[At the same time, the following was added to the second paragraph: *If such have otherwise misbehaved, and removed without the acknowledged limits of any monthly meeting, the monthly meeting may disown them; and if within the limits of any monthly meeting, may forward a certificate with a statement of such misbehavior, to such monthly meeting as they may have removed to, which monthly meeting may deal with or disown them*].[11]

[In 1854, the following was added to the second paragraph: *If any remove to a Monthly Meeting, of any other Yearly Meeting, a statement of such behavior should be sent to the Monthly Meeting without a certificate, and the Monthly Meeting to which such person may have removed should be requested to deal with the offender, and forward the result of their labor to the Monthly Meeting from whence the offender came. All Monthly Meetings are to receive certificates sent to them, or forward the same to their Quarterly Meeting for its final decision whether the certificate should be received or not.*][12]

CHARITY AND UNITY

It is advised that when any appearance of dissen--tion, variance, or resentment should be discovered amongst our members, the parties be tenderly apprized of the danger to which it exposes them and others, and exhorted to mutual condescention and forgiveness; and if any, notwithstanding such admonition, manifest an implacable animosity, the Overseers or other solid Friends of the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, should be informed thereof, and labour further with them: and if they still prove inflexible, they ought to be testified against, as out of unity with the Body.[13]

[In 1822, the word *disowned* was substituted for *testified against*.][14]

---

[11] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1822*, pp. 9, 10.

[12] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1854*, p. 15.

[13] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1809*, p. 9.

[14] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1822*, p. 11.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

It is the sense of the Yearly Meeting, that if any of our members accept, or act in the office of member of the Federal or State Legislature, Justice of the Peace, Clerk of a Court, Coroner, Sheriff or Constable, that they be dealt with, and if they cannot be convinced of the inconsistency of their conduct, after sufficient labor, they be disowned.[15]

CONDUCT AND CONVERSATION

All who are guilty of lying, swearing, cursing, men and women unlawfully keeping company with each other, or any other scandalous practice; and all who occasion public scandal, should be dealt with by the Overseers, or other concerned Friends: and if they are brought to a sense of their offence, they ought, without improper delay, to remove the scandal, and clear as much as within them lies, our holy profession therefrom, by acknowledging the offence and condemning the same in writing, to the satisfaction of the Monthly Meeting. And when any such offender refuses or neglects to acknowledge and condemn the fault, the Monthly Meeting ought speedily to testify against him or her, and the fact.

If any in membership with us shall blaspheme, or speak profanely of Almighty God, Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit, or deny the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit or the authenticity of the Scriptures,--as it is manifest, they are not one in faith with us, the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, having extended due care for the benefit of such individual or individuals without effect, ought to testify their disunity with them.[16]

[In 1822, disown was substituted for testify against.][17]

CONVINCED PERSONS

It is directed that the following order be observed respecting persons who apply for membership:--They are to apply to the Overseers or other discreet Friends, who are to lay the case before the Preparative Meeting; and after that meeting is fully satisfied, by paying a visit or otherwise, they are to lay it before the Monthly Meeting, which is to appoint some suitable friends to enquire into the lives and conversations of the applicants, and also to take solid opportunities of conference with them, in order to understand whether their motives for such request be sincere, and on the grounds of convincement and report their sense, with which, if the meeting be satisfied, minute should be made, signifying the acceptance of such into membership. Such as have once been members, and have been disowned, are, if they wish to join in society again, to request as other applicants.[18]

---

[15] Discipline, NCYM, 1809, p. 9.

[16] Ibid., pp. 9, 10.

[17] Discipline, NCYM, 1822, p. 12.

[In 1822, the first sentence was amended to read: . . . they are to lay it before the monthly meeting; _and if said meeting is not free to receive them at that time_, it is to appoint . . .

[Following phrase inserted before reference to disowned persons: _But neither the men's nor the women's meeting is to receive or disown members without the consent of the other meeting._[19]

[In 1854, _either_ was substituted for _neither_ in the 1822 amendment above][20]

DAYS AND TIMES

As we are persuaded that no religious act can be acceptable to God, unless produced by the influence and assistance of his Holy Spirit, it is our judgement that our members cannot consistently join with any in the observance of public Fasts, Feasts or what are termed Holy Days, or such injunctions and forms as are devised by the will of man, in regard thereto: for though exterious observances of a similar kind were authorized under the law, yet they who come to Christ will assuredly find that in him all shadows end: and therefore, when any in membership with us do join in any of the above mentioned observances, that they be admonished to a more circumspect conduct and if they will not refrain, Monthly Meetings are to testify against them.[21]

[In 1822, _disown_ was substituted for _testify against_.][22]

---

[18] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1809_, pp. 10, 11.

[19] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1822_, p. 12.

[20] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1964_, p. 17.

[21] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1809_, p. 11.

[22] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1822_, p. 13.

DEFAMATION AND DETRACTION

Friends are exhorted to maintain a strict watch over themselves and each other, against the subtle and mischievious spirit of tale-bearing and detraction; the manifest tendency of which is to lay waste the unity of the body by sowing seeds of disesteem, strife and discord among brethren and neighbors. It is advised, therefore, that in whomsoever this weekness [sic] appears, it may be immediately checked, & if persisted in, let him be faithfully admonished; and unless they give due satisfaction, the preparative meeting should be informed, and deal further with them; when, if that produce not the desired effect, the Monthly Meeting should proceed to testify against them. And if any member who offends in this respect, shelter himself or herself under pretense that they say no more than they have heard from others but will not discover who they are; such reporters or tale-bearers should, in like manner, be dealt with and testified against as being themselves the authors.[23]

[In 1822, disown was substituted for testified against.][24]

DISCIPLINE AND MEETINGS FOR DISCIPLINE

The connection and subordination of our meetings for discipline are thus: Preparative meetings are accountable to the Monthly; Monthly to the Quarterly, and Quarterly to the Yearly Meeting. So that, if the Yearly Meeting be at any time dissatisfied with the proceedings of any inferiour meeting; or the Quarterly with the proceedings of either of its Monthly Meetings; or a Monthly Meeting with the proceedings of either of its Preparatory Meetings--such meetings ought, with readiness and meekness to render an account thereof when required.

It is agreed that No Quarterly Meeting be set up or put down, without the consent of the Yearly Meeting; no Monthly meeting without the consent of the Quarterly Meeting; nor any Preparative or other meeting for business, or worship, 'till application to the Monthly Meeting is first made, and when there approved, the consent of the Quarterly Meeting be also had.

It is directed that a book be provided by every Monthly and Quarterly Meeting, and fair minutes kept therein, of all matters which shall come before, or be determined by them. Monthly Meetings particularly are advised to attend to and finish all business with care and dispatch, so that it may at no time suffer by improper delay. And if any case under consideration prove too weighty, or difficult for them to determine, they should apply to their respective Quarterly Meeting for assistance. It is the sense of this meeting as a general rule in all cases, that when any Monthly or Quarterly Meeting has occasion for, and requests copies of any of the papers, minutes or records [sic] of another Monthly or Quarterly Meeting, that the same be granted.

---

[23] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 11, 12.

[24] Discipline, NCYM 1822, p. 13.

Each Monthly Meeting should appoint a suitable number of Friends to attend the service of the Quarterly Meeting, with such written reports, signed by their clerk, as may be given them in charge: Also a suitable number of Friends should be appointed by each Quarterly Meeting, to attend the service of the Yearly Meeting. And it is earnestly advised and desired that all Friends who submit to these or any other services of the Society, may be punctual in their attendance thereon: or, if prevented by sickness, or by any other unavoidable occurance, that they be careful to send information thereof. Also that those who are under appointment to meetings do not withdraw therefrom before the conclusion, without obtaining the meeting's consent.[25]

[The following sentence was added in 1854: It is the judgement of the Yearly Meeting that our meetings for discipline be kept select.][26]

GAMING AND DIVERSIONS

It is advised that a watchful care be exercised over our members, to prevent their going to stage plays, taverns, horse-races, music and dancing, or any other such sports and pastimes; and being concerned in lotteries, wagering, or any species of gaming, and if any of our members fall into any of these practices and cannot be prevailed on by private labour, to decline them, the Monthly Meeting to which the offenders belong should be informed thereof, and if they cannot be reclaimed by further labour, proceed to testify their disunity with them.[27]

[In 1822, disown them was substituted for testify their disunity with them.][28]

---

[25] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 12, 13.

[26] Discipline, NCYM 1854, p. 19.

[27] Discipline, NCYM 1809, p. 13.

[28] Discipline, NCYM 1822, p. 15.

LAW

It is the sense and judgement of the Yearly Meeting that if any member of our religious society, disregarding the gospel order prescribed by our Discipline, shall arrest or sue at law any other member, or members of any meeting, not being under the necessity to do so, they, in so doing, depart from the peaceable principles of which we make profession, and if on being treated with by monthly meetings to which they belong, they cannot be prevailed on to withdraw the suit, and pay the costs of it, they should be disowned.[29]

[The first part of the section was amended to read as follows in 1822: _It is the sense and judgement of the Yearly Meeting that if any in membership with us, disregarding the gospel order prescribed by our Discipline, shall arrest, or sue at law or equity, any other members of any meeting, except in the cases admissable under the head "Arbitrations," without first obtaining leave of the monthly meeting of which the complaintant is a member, they, in so doing . . ._][30]

MARRIAGE

It is affectionately desired by the Yearly Meeting that all young or unmarried persons in membership with us, previously to their making _any_ proceedure in order to marriage do seriously and humbly wait upon the Lord for his counsel and direction in this important concern: and when favoured with satisfactory clearness therein, they should early acquaint their Parents or Guardians with their intentions, and wait for their consent. Thus preservation from the dangerous bias of forward and uncertain affection would be experienced to the real benefit of the parties, and the comfort of their friends. And it is earnestly recommended to Friends, that they tenderly and carefully watch over the youth, and extend seasonable caution and admonition relative to this interesting subject, as occasion may require.

All single persons, about to marry at a distance from home, are to procure from the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, certificates of their rights of membership, and clearance from any other person in respect to marriage engagements; and none are to be permitted to join themselves in marriage until such certificates are produced. No Monthly Meeting is to permit any marriage to be proposed therein sooner than one year after the decease of a former wife or husband.

---

[29] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1809_, p. 14.

[30] _Discipline_, _NCYM_, _1822_, p. 15.

The Yearly Meeting, being tender concerning marriages, desire that no misdemeanor be treasured up against a person until the time of presenting marriage to the meeting, and then disclosed, though perhaps long done, and known to those who so object ot it at that time; which being a wrong thing, should be prohibited in all meetings.

It is recommended to Friends be careful that men and women who make or receive proposals of marriage, do not dwell together in the same house, from the commencement of such concern until the marriage be accomplished; that no ground may be furnished for evil reports or surmises, but our holy profession be maintained unsullied in the view of men.

Let such of our members be admonished who keep company in order for marriage, with persons not of our society, or with bond servants, or apprentices, without leave of their masters or mistresses; and all who are either present themselves or consent to their children being present at marriages, or marriage entertainments, of a member or members, accomplished contrary to our order, are to be dealt with; and where they cannot be brought to a sense of their error, let them be testified against. And any of our members who may accomplish their marriage contrary to our well-known and established order, such step is to be considered as a relinquishment of their right in society; and monthly meetings are accordingly to testify against them.

When Parents or Guardians have approved the visits or addresses of a member of society to any of their children, or those under their care, they ought not to retract the same without giving such reasons as shall be satisfactory to the Monthly Meeting.

For the accomplishment of marriage, the following order is to be observed: If both parties belong to the same Monthly Meeting, the men's and women's Monthly Meeting should be informed of their intentions, and the man, at a proper time, be accompanied into the women's apartment by a friend or two; there the parties are first to declare, "That they intend marriage with each other;" Whereupon two women Friends are to be appointed, on minute, to make enquiry respecting the woman, and then proceed to the men's meeting, where they are to make the same declaration; and two men Friends be, in like manner, appointed to enquire into the clearness of the man from any other marriage engagements. If the parties have Parents or Guardians present, their consent should be expressed. If the woman be a widow having children, two men Friends should be appointed in the meeting of which she is a member, to see that the rights of her children be legally secured.

At the next meeting, if the committees report that careful enquiry has been made, and no obstruction to the further proceedings of the parties appears, the meetings are then to leave them at liberty to accomplish their marriage according to our rule and appoint two Friends of each sex to attend, and see that good order is observed. Marriages are to be solemnized at the meeting-house where the woman belongs, and towards the conclusion of the meeting the parties are to stand up, and, taking each other by the hand, are to declare to the following effect: the man first: "I take this my friend D. E. to be my wife, promising through divine assistance to be unto her a loving and faithful husband until death separates us." And the woman in like manner--"I take this my friend A. B. to be my husband, promising, with divine assistance, to be unto him a faithful and loving wife until death separates us." The marriage certificate is then to be audibly read by some proper person, the express description of the parties being first inserted; they are then to sign the same, the man first, then the woman, with the assumed name of her husband; the relatives next, and such others as are disposed to subscript as witnesses.

The form of the marriage certificate shall be as follows:

"Whereas A. B. son of C. and D. in the county
"of and state of , and E. F. daughter
"of H. and I. of the same place, having declared their
"intention of "marriage with each other before a Monthly
"Meeting of "Friends, held at in the county and
"state aforesaid, and after due enquiry nothing appearing
"to hinder, were allowed by said meeting to proceed--
"Now these are to certify whom it may concern--That
"for the full accomplishment of their said intention,
"this day of month, in the year of
"our Lord one thousand eight hundred and , they,
"the said A. B. and E. F. appeared at a public meeting
"of Friends at meeting house, in the county
"of and they, the said A. B. and E. F. did,
"in a public manner, openly declare that they took each
"other for husband, and wife; and as a further confirma-
"tion thereof, they the said A. B. and E. F. did to
these presents set their hands, she, according to the
"custom of marriage, assumeing the name of her husband.

A. B.
E. B.

"We, whose names are here subscribed,
"were present at the solemnization of
"the above said marriage."

It is further directed that Marriages be accomplished decently, gravely and weightily; and that the parties, their parents and others concerned take care, at the house where they go, after the solemnization is over, that no reproach arise, by any intemperate feasting or drinking, or by any unseemly, wanton, or rude discourse or action; but that all behave with such sobriety as becomes a people fearing God; and that the company retire in a seasonable time. And the Overseers are to make report to the next Monthly Meeting whether good order has been observed, and take care that the marriage certificate be returned to be recorded. That marriages of persons too closely related may, as much as possible, be prevented, it is the conclusion of the Yearly Meeting that no marriages between any so near as first cousins, not the children of half-brothers or half-sisters be permitted amongst us; and when any such persons intermarry, their so doing shall be considered as a relinquishment of their right in our religious society, and they are to be disowned by the Monthly Meeting of which they are members.[31]

[In 1822, disowned was substituted for testified against. Provisions for time and place of marriage were amended as follows: Marriages are to be solemnized at the meeting-house where the woman belongs, on a weakday [sic], except the monthly meeting consents it shall be elsewhere, or on first day. Phrase concerning the marriage certificate amended to read as follows: The marriage certificate is then to be read audibly by some suitable Friend. The following words were elided: the express description of the parties being first inserted.][32]

[In 1836, the provisions regarding notification of the Monthly Meeting were simplified as follows: . . . of their intention, by proposals in writing, signed by both parties, whereupon two men Friends and two women Friends are to be appointed to enquire into the clearness. . . .][33]

MEETINGS FOR WORSHIP

This meeting recommends that Friends who are exercised in the Discipline, would early extend their brotherly love and care in visiting such among us who neglect to attend our meetings for public worship. And as a wilful neglect of this important duty is a manifest evidence of ingratitude to the Divine Being, contrary to the example and practice of the primitive believers in Christ and our religious testimony--it is the sense of this meeting that as such disunite themselves from christian fellowship with Friends, Monthly Meetings, after having fully discharged their duty towards them, and finding their endeavours to reclaim them ineffectual, should testify our disunity with them.

---

[31] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 14-18.

[32] Discipline, NCYM 1822, pp. 16, 17.

[33] Discipline, NCYM 1836, p. 34.

As the appearance of a drowsy spirit in our religious meeting is offensive, and may be a cause of stumbling to sober enquirers, it is earnestly desired that this weakness may not exist among us. And as indulgence therein must have a disqualifying effect, it is the sense and judgement of this meeting that Quarterly, Monthly and other meetings should be cautious of appointing such, as give way to the weakness, in the weighty affairs ofthe church.[34]

[In 1822, disown was substituted for testify our disunity with at the end of the first paragraph.][35]

MEMORIALS

If any Monthly Meeting should, upon solid consideration, believe it would be profitable to prepare a memorial concerning a deceased brother, such memorial is to be sent to the respective Quarterly Meeting, where it is to be further considered, and if there approved, is from thence to be sent to the Meeting for Sufferings, in order for inspection and approbation, previously to its being laid before the Yearly Meeting, and if there approved, it is to be recorded in a book of memorials. [This entire head adopted for the first time in 1854.][36]

MINISTERS AND ELDERS, AND THEIR MEETINGS

When there is occasion for the appointment of one or more Elders in any meeting, a proposal of name or names should be offered to the Monthly Meeting, and a committee appointed to enquire into the unity Friends have with them in that station. If, upon due consideration, the nomination is approved, a minute should be made, and a copy thereof forwarded to the Quarterly Meeting.

When any Friend has frequently appeared in our religious meetings as a Minister, and the Preparative

---

[34] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 18, 19.

[35] Discipline, NCYM 1822, p. 19.

[36] Discipline, NCYM 1854 , p. 25.

Meeting of Ministers and Elders apprehends it seasonable, the subject should claim the attention of the Monthly Meeting for discipline, of which the person is a member, they are at liberty to mention the matter therein, and if the Monthly Meeting, after deliberate consideration, shall unite in believing that a gift in the ministry has been committed to him or her, a minute expressive thereof should be forwarded to the Quarterly Meeting, where the case being solidly weighed and concerned with, information thereof should be sent to the Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders, of which the party is to be a member. And, until the approbation of the Quarterly Meeting is obtained, no such Friend is to be received as a Minister, nor permitted to travel abroad as a Minister, nor appoint any meeting, without consent of the Monthly Meeting to which he or she belongs.

No such approved Minister is to appoint any meeting without consent of the Monthly Meeting.

Whenever any approved Minister apprehends it to be his or her duty to travel in Truth's service, out of the limits of this Yearly Meeting, they are to open the concern in the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, and obtain a certificate of its unity and concurrence, directed to Friends in the parts proposed to be visited, and obtain the consent of the Quarterly Meeting. And when the service is accomplished, the said Monthly Meeting ought to be informed, and the certificate returned without unnecessary delay.

No minister may go beyond sea to Europe or the West Indies, without concurrence of the Yearly Meeting.

Friends are advised to be careful of receiving traveling Friends without certificate. If any shall oppose a ministering Friend in his or her preaching or exhortation, keep on the hat or show any remarkable dislike to such when engaged in prayer, let them be speedily admonished in such a manner as may be requisite; unless the person against whom the uneasiness is expressed has been disowned, or his or her appearance disapproved by the Monthly Meeting.

On the contrary, when any has aught against what was publicly delivered, they are to speak to the party privately and orderly. The Ministers and Elders of each Monthly Meeting are to meet once in three months at such time and place as the Monthly Meeting may direct, in the capacity of a Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders--when the queries addressed to such meetings are to be read, and answers made to them, signed by the clerk, and conveyed to the ensuing Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, by a suitable number of representatives. And in the said Quarterly Meetings the queries are also to be read and the answers from the respective Preparative Meetings, and the state of the members weightily considered--and once a year those answers, comprised in a report, signed by the clerk are to be forwarded to the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, by representatives appointed for that purpose. In this meeting the queries are also to be read, and the answers from the several quarters, and the state of this part of the society being thus collected and considered, advices adapted thereto, may, if requisite, be issued to the subordinate meetings of like kind.

None of the said Meetings of Ministers and Elders are in any wise to interfere with the business of any meeting for discipline; nor is the Yearly Meeting for Ministers and Elders to suffer its adjournments to interfere with the sittings of the Yearly Meeting for Discipline.

And finally, When any acknowledged member of the Select Meeting shall at any time be thought, by negligence or otherwise, to have lost his or her service in that station, so as to become burthensome, (yet not so as to be under the care of the Monthly Meeting for discipline, or misconduct) it is adviced that timely and tender care be extended to such, according to gospel order; and if such care prove ineffectual, that some discreet Friend lay the same before the Monthly Meeting of which he is a member, and if the Meeting concur therewith, that they be forwarded to the Quarterly Meeting for their approbation, and discontinuance of such Friend from their station, which is to be certified to the Meeting of Ministers and Elders.[37]

MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS

Previous to the year 1824, there were standing committees appointed by the Yearly Meeting from time to time, to attend to Society concerns during the recess of the Yearly Meeting. In that year a Meeting for Sufferings was instituted by appointment of members within the limits of New Garden, Deep River, Western and Southern Quarterly Meetings, the other Quarters are each to appoint three members as correspondents, who, when in attendance, are to have equal priviledges with those appointed by the Yearly Meeting. The meetings are to be held at Deep River meeting-house on the 2nd second day in the 4th month, and the sixth day previous to the Yearly Meeting.

The following directions are to be observed by the Monthly Meeting for sufferings:

1st. It shall keep minutes of its proceedings and lay them annually before the Yearly Meeting.

2nd. Fifteen members shall constitute a meeting, capable of transacting business.

---

[37] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 19-21.

3rd. Four members may call a special meeting when they shall judge it necessary.

4th. Provided a vacancy, occasioned by the decease or removal of a member appointed either by the Yearly or Quarterly Meeting, should not be seasonably supplied, the Meeting for Sufferings is to notify the meeting of such death or removal in order that the vacancy may be filled by a new appointment.

The services confided to the Meeting for Sufferings are:

1st. In general to represent the Yearly Meeting and act in its behalf in cases where the interest or reputation of our religious Society may render it necessary.

2nd. To have the oversight and inspection of all manuscripts prepared to be published relative to our religious profession or testimonies, and to promote or discourage the publication of them at their discretion, to reprint and distribute any writings, which they may judge would be useful, and when expenses are incurred in the execution of these duties, they are to draw on the treasurer of the Yearly Meeting for the amount.

3rd. To inspect and ascertain titles to land and other estates belonging to any of our meetings, and attend to the appropriations of charitable legacies and donations.

4th. To receive from the Quarterly Meetings such memorials concerning deceased Friends as shall be forwarded, that after the necessary inspection and correction, they may be laid before the Yearly Meeting, unless in some cases the Meeting for Sufferings should on solid consideration judge it inexpedient.

5th. To extend such advice and assistance to persons under suffering for our testimonies as their cases may require, and apply to the Government or persons in authority in those and other occasions as they may judge necessary.

6th. To correspond with other Meetings for Sufferings as occasion may require.

All approved ministers and members of other Meetings for Sufferings are at liberty to attend sittings of this meeting.

[This section added in 1854.][38]

MODERATION AND TEMPERENCE

It is earnestly recommended to our members to guard against the unnecessary use of intoxicating liquors, and the distilling, importing, or vending of them as articles of commerce, or giving them at vendues to excite bidding; and if any proceed in the practices aforesaid, to the dissatisfaction of the Monthly Meeting to which they belong, said meeting is to extend labour and advice in the matter, as they may think best; and if such members neglect or refuse the counsel of their friends, they are to be testified against.[39]

---

[38] Discipline, NCYM 1854, pp. 28-29.

[In 1822, disowned was substituted for testified against.][40]

NEGROES AND SLAVES

As a religious Society we have found it to be our indispensible duty to declare to the world our belief of the repugnancy of Slavery to the Christian Religion. It therefore remains to be our continued concern to prohibit our members from holding in bondage our fellowmen.

If any in membership with us shall hire any slaves of their master, to assist them in their business, it is the judgement of the Yearly Meeting that in so doing they promote the unrighteous traffic, and oppose our testimony against Slavery; and if they cannot be prevailed on to desist, Monthly Meetings are at liberty to declare their disunity with them.

A proper regard to this testimony would lead our members to avoid acting as Executors or Administrators to estates where slaves are bequeathed; or being accessory to any step whereby their bondage may be prolonged.

If any of our members are concerned in selling or purchasing or shall give away any Negro or slave, or accept of any such gift or assignment, so as to perpetuate their slavery, they ought to be speedily treated with, in a spirit of love and wisdom, in order to convince them of the iniquity of their conduct; and if, after such Christian labour, they are not brought to such a sense of their injustice as to do whatever the Monthly Meeting shall judge to be necessary for the restoration of such slave to his or her natural liberty, and condemn their deviation from the laws of righteousness and equity, to the satisfaction of the said meeting, such ought to be testified against, as other transgressors are, for immoral, unjust and reproachful conduct.[41]

---

[39] Discipline, NCYM 1809, pp. 21, 22.

[40] Discipline, NCYM 1822, p. 22.

[41] Discipline NCYM, 1809, pp. 22, 23.

[In 1822, *disown them* was substituted for *declare their disunity with them*. Following phrase was added in paragraph 4: *or prevent such from the benefit of their labour*, they ought to be speedily. . . .[42]

[In 1836, the second paragraph was amended to read in part as follows: If any in membership with us *shall buy any slaves of their master or mistress, with a view of sending them to free governments, when their servises shall have paid the vendee for their purchase; or hire any in slavery of their master or mistress to assist them in their business; or take minor slaves for a time, and then return them to their masters*; . . .][43]

OATHS

If any in membership with us shall be guilty of swearing before legal authority, or of administering an oath, instead of our approved, priviledged and ancient manner of affirming--as it is a deviation from our principles, such ought to be treated with; and if they do not come to a sense and acknowledgement of their error, monthly meetings should disown them. [This section included for the first time in 1822.][44]

OVERSEERS

It is the recommendation of the Yearly Meeting, as productive of very beneficial consequences to Society, that in every Monthly Meeting a proper number of faithful and discreet Friends be appointed to the station of Overseers within the same; whose duty it is to exercise a vigilant and tender care over their fellow members, and render account of their services to Monthly Meetings when required.[45]

[In 1822, the following was added: *and also to inform the monthly meeting of orphans and others, belonging to the same, who need guardians; and on such information, the meeting is to appoint a committee to examine their situation; and promote suitable persons to the guardianship*.][46]

---

[42] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1822*, pp. 22, 23.

[43] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1836*, p. 43.

[44] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1822*, p. 23.

[45] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, p. 23.

[46] *Discipline*, *NCYM*, *1822*, p. 23.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

In case of any Parents making application for their Children to be received into membership, if monthly meetings are fully satisfied concerning the clear convincement of such parents, they may receive such children in Minority into membership: and if one of the Parents come in by request, their children should have no right in our Society, "till Monthly Meetings are free to receive by their own request. But if both parents have been members, after marriage, and one of them be disowned, and they have Children afterwards, such Children should be looked upon as having full right in our society. It is further the judgement of the Yearly Meeting that no illegitimate Child should be considered as having a Birth-right in our Society.[47]

PLAINNESS IN DRESS AND ADDRESS

It is earnestly advised, that all our members may keep themselves and their children, in minority, to moderation, and plainness of Gesture, Speech and Apparel, and Furniture of houses; and it is hoped that when any deviate from the above advice, that friends will be strict in wisdom, to take due and prudent care therein, and if pious care and endeavours prove ineffectual, Monthly Meetings may disown such offenders.[48]

POOR

It is advised that the cases of all indigent Friends be duly inspected, and advice and relief may be seasonably afforded, their necessities relieved, and due and prudent care taken for the education of their children.[49]

QUERIES

It is agreed that once each quarter the eight following Queries be read, deliberately considered, and answered in each Preparative and Monthly Meeting, and an explicit account conveyed to every Yearly Meeting.

1. Are Meetings for Worship and Discipline duly attended--the hour observed--and do Friends avoid all unbecoming behavior therein?

---

[47] Discipline, NCYM 1809, p. 23.

[48] Discipline, NCYM 1809, p. 24.

[49] Ibid., p. 24.

2. Are Love and Unity preserved among you, and do you discourage all Tale-bearing and Detraction and when Differences arise are endeavours speedily used to end them?

3. Do Friends keep to Plainness and Moderation in every part of their conduct; and do those who have children endeavour to train them up in the principles of our Religion, to reading the Holy Scriptures, and use the necessary restraints for their preservation?

4. Are Friends clear of the unnecessary use of intoxicating liquors, and distilling, importing, or vending them as articles of commerce; are they careful to guard against frequenting Taverns and places for diversion; or are any concerned in gaming or lotteries?

5. Are Friends clear of Purchasing, disposing of, or holding mankind as Slaves; and do they use those well who are set free, and under their care through non-age, or otherwise, endeavouring to encourage them in a virtuous life?

6. Are Friends careful to live within the bounds of their circumstances; do they avoid launching into trade, or business beyond their abilities; are they just in their dealings, and punctual in fulfilling their engagements; or are any concerned in any fraudulant or clandestine trade?

7. Are the necessities of poor Friends relieved, and care taken for the education of their children; are not [sic] the rights of Friend's children neglected nor are they placed from amongst us without consent of the Monthly Meeting?

8. Do any commence suits at law against a Friend in unity, without consent of the Monthly Meeting?

Desired that the following advice be read over after the Queries, in a solemn, deliberate manner, and carefully attended to:

That Friends be careful to keep Wills by them--that public gifts or legacies be applied to the uses intended by the Donors, That care be taken respecting removals, and that Friends about to remove apply for Certificates. That early care be taken to advise and deal with such as appear inclinable to marry contrary to Discipline; and if Parents give their consent, or contrive at their children therein, that they and those who may attend such marriages be dealt with accordingly.

That Friends keep proper records of Marriages, births and deaths.

That care be taken to advise those who may appear inclinable, against marrying with too near kindred.

And lastly, we recommend, that Friends everywhere behave themselves orderly, both in their converse and commerce, so as to answer the witness for truth in them with whom they are concerned.[50]

[In 1822, the introductory paragraph was amended to read in part as follows: It is agreed that once *in the second and third quarters each, succeeding the yearly meeting, the first four of the following queries, and once in the quarter immediately preceeding the yearly meeting, all of them,* be read, deliberately considered, and answered in the preparative, monthly and *quarterly* meetings . . .

[At the same time, the following was added to Query 1: *And is due care taken, when any thing appears amiss, that the rules of our discipline be timely put in practice?*[51]

[In 1836, Query 4 was amended to include: *or having them distilled?* Also, a new Query was inserted following Query 4: *Do Friends bear a faithful testimony against war?*][52]

[In 1854, the introduction to the section was amended to call for reading the first *5* Queries in the second and third quarters following the yearly meeting. In Query 1, the last phrase, added in 1822, was deleted and added to Query 2. In Query 5, the following phrase was added: *also against a hireling minstry?* In addition, the following paragraph was added: *The Yearly Meeting directs that the Quarterly Meeting report annually to the Yearly Meeting, the names of deceased Ministers or Elders within their limits the past year, what are their ages, and how long they have stood in those relations.*][53]

QUERIES FOR MINISTERS AND ELDERS

The Yearly Meeting directs that once a quarter, the following queries, for the use of the Select Meeting, be read and answered, and distinct answers sent to the like Quarterly Meeting, in order that one be made out for the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders:

1st. Are Ministers and Elders careful to attend all their meetings in due time, taking their families with them, as circumstances admit; and are they good examples in waiting therein?

2nd. Are all public Friends sound in their ministry, and careful to administer in the right ability?

---

[50] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, pp. 24-26.

[51] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1822*, pp. 24-26.

[52] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1836*, pp. 47-50.

[53] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1854*, pp. 32-34.

3rd. Are the lives and conversations of Ministers and Elders clean and blameless among men, ruling their own houses well, being exemplary themselves?

4th. Are Ministers and Elders in Unity with one another, and with the Meeting to which they belong; and do none overcharge themselves with business to the hurting of their service?

5th. Are Ministers and Elders careful to be exemplary in their conduct relative to marriage?

6th. Are they careful to maintain the Discipline of the Church, so that Truth's cause may not suffer by their conduct?

7th. Do any travel abroad as a Minister without being first recommended to, and accepted by the Quarterly Meeting to which they belong as such, or appoint Meeting disorderly?

8th. Do you watch over one-another for good, and are you careful to help those who are young in the ministry in the right line thereof?[54]

[In 1822, queries 5 and 7 were deleted. At the same time, the first sentence in the introductory paragraph was amended to read, in part: . . . once a quarter, excepting that following each yearly meeting . . .][55]

[In 1836, Query 2 was amended to read: Are *ministers* sound in *word and doctrine, and careful to minister in the ability which God giveth?* The following Query was also added: *Do ministers and elders guard against an anxious disposition for the accumulation of wealth, and in their dealings and intercourse with men--do they unto all as they would be willing to be done unto?*][56]

SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

We tenderly advise and exhort all Parents and heads of families to advise and instruct their children and families in the doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion, as contained in the Scriptures; and that they excite them to the diligent reading of these excellent books.[57]

---

[54] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, pp. 26, 27.

[55] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1822*, pp. 26, 27.

[56] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1836*, pp. 50-52.

[57] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, p. 27.

TAVERNS

We think it necessary to caution all our members against frequenting Taverns and other places of public resort; and it is the judgement of this meeting that none of our members engage in Tavern-keeping, or any such employ for a livelihood. And if any are in danger on these accounts, they should be timely and tenderly dealt with, in order to convince them of their danger, and if they cannot be prevailed on to desist, they should be testified against.[58]

[In 1822, *disowned* was substituted for *testified against*.][59]

TESTIMONIES

It is the judgement of the Yearly Meeting that offenders who incline to make acknowledgement of their offences, shall prepare the same in writing, and therein particularize the matter or matters charged upon them, and show it to the Overseers, or Committee appointed in their case; and if the purport is judged to be suitable to the occasion, the party may present it to the Monthly Meeting.

It is also the conclusion of the Yearly Meeting, that it is not expedient at our meetings for worship to read any testimonies of denial.[60]

[In 1822, the first paragraph was amended as follows: It is the judgement of the Yearly Meeting that offenders who incline to make acknowledgement of their offence *may* prepare the same in writing, and therein particularize the matter or matters charged upon them, and show it to the overseers or committee appointed in their case, and if the purport is judged suitable to the occasion, *such* may present it to the *preparative* or monthly meeting.][61]

[In 1854, the reference to the preparative meeting was deleted.][62]

---

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[59] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1822*, p. 27.

[60] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, p. 28.

[61] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1822*, p. 27.

[62] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1854*, p. 27.

TRADE

This meeting recommends to all its members, that they be careful not to venture on such business as they do not understand, nor to involve themselves in trade beyond their ability to manage; but that they bound their engagements by their means; and when they give their words, or enter into contracts, that they endeavour on all occasions strictly to fulfill them.

And that Friends be cautioned against purchasing any kind of prize goods, or removing any contraband from any port; and if any depart from the counsel of their brethren, in these respects, they should be speedily treated with for their restoration; and if such treatment prove ineffectual, they should be disowned.[63]

[In 1822, paragraph two was amended to read in part: And Friends are cautioned against purchasing any kind of prize goods, or _running_ any contraband goods from any port, _or being concerned in any fraudulant or clandestine trade_.][64]

WAR

Friends are exhorted faithfully to adhere to our testimony against Wars, and fightings, and in no way to unite with any in warlike measures, either offensive or defensive; or in privateering, or as owners of ships, going with Letters of Marque--that by the inoffensiveness of our lives, we may convincingly demonstrate ourselves to be the real subjects of the Messiah's peaceful reign.

And if any deviate from this our ancient testimony, or approve, or show the least connivance at war, by attending at muster fields, or viewing military operations; or in any wise encouraging the unstable, deceitful spirit of party; illuminating their houses in token of rejoicing for victory obtained in war; or by joining political devices or associations: they are to be tenderly dealt with, and if they cannot be brought to acknowledge and forsake their error, Monthly Meeting should testify against them.[65]

[In 1822, _disown_ was substituted for _testify against_.][66]

---

[63] _Discipline_, _NCYM_ _1809_, p. 28.

[64] _Discipline_, _NCYM_ _1822_, p. 28.

[65] _Discipline_, _NCYM_ _1809_, pp. 28, 29.

[66] _Discipline_, _NCYM_ _1822_, p. 28.

WOMEN'S MEETINGS

Recommended that Women Friends continue to hold Preparative, Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings in separate apartments; and therein to have the care and oversight of their own Sex, and exercise discipline relating thereto.[67]

[In 1854, the following was added: *And request the judgement and assistance of men Friends when they think it necessary*.][68]

---

[67] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1809*, p. 29.

[68] *Discipline*, *NCYM* *1854*, p. 36.

APPENDIX II

THE DISOWNMENTS

Perquimans	253
Pasquotank	254
Sutton's Creek	255
Rich Square	256
Core Sound	257
Contentnea	258
Neuse	259
Cane Creek	260
Spring	261
Holly Springs	262
New Garden	263
Dover	264
Hopewell	265
Center	266
Back Creek	267
Marlboro	268
Deep River	269
Springfield	270
Union	271
Westfield	272
Deep Creek	273

All disownments, by cause 274
All disownments, by monthly meeting 275

Perquimans MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	53	40	46	35	29	31	234
Slavery	10	12	5	8	4	2	41
Lack of Plainness	2	4	1	6	3	1	17
Gross Language	5	1	6	4	2	1	18
Joining another Society			1	1	4	8	14
Removal		1	1	2			4
Military Actions		1	1	10	2		14
Cause not Stated	6	12	7	8	2	4	39
Quarrels or Disputes				1			1
Neglect of Meeting	6	3	3	6	2	2	22
Unsettled debts		1	1				2
Diversions	1						1
Suits at Law vs. Friends	1	1					2
Disorderly Conduct	3						3
Attending unauth. Marriage	3						3
Accepting Civil Office			1				1
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU						7	7
Totals	90	76	73	81	48	55	423
Confessed MOU							

Pasquotank MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	31	45	38	22	11	2	139
Slavery	7	4		4	5		20
Lack of Plainness	6	2	2	2	1		13
Gross Language	1	1		1			3
Joining another Society			3	4	6		13
Removal	2						2
Military Actions	1			1			2
Cause not Stated	10	13	5	4	1		33
Quarrels or Disputes	1						1
Neglect of Meeting	15	11	6	4	4	1	41
Unsettled debts							
Diversions	4						4
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct	2						2
Attending unauth. Marriage	1	4	7				12
Accepting Civil Office			1				1
Not Keeping Principles	1						1
Misconduct		2	1	1			4
Use of Violence		2					2
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	1		1				2
Totals	83	74	64	43	28	3	295
Confessed MOU							

(Laid down 1835) Sutton's Creek MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	39	26	43	21			129
Slavery	5	3					8
Lack of Plainness	4	1	1	3			9
Gross Language	6	5	2	2			15
Joining another Society		1		1			2
Removal	2	3					5
Military Actions	1						1
Cause not Stated	13	8	10	5			36
Quarrels or Disputes		2					2
Neglect of Meeting	2	2	6	1			11
Unsettled debts	6	1					7
Diversions	3	1	5				9
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage	2	1	4	3			10
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles			1				1
Misconduct							
Use of Violence				1			1
"Patterowling"				1			1
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU							
Totals	83	34	72	38			247
Confessed MOU	1		1				2

Rich Square MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	13	14	16	7	5	11	66
Slavery	2	2	2			1	7
Lack of Plainness	1	2	1	3	2		9
Gross Language	1						1
Joining another Society		3				2	5
Removal							
Military Actions	1	2			1		4
Cause not Stated	8	8	1	3	3	7	30
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting	2	1		2		3	8
Unsettled debts	1						1
Diversions	1	1					2
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage	1	2	1				4
Accepting Civil Office					1		1
Not Keeping Principles		4		1			5
Misconduct							
Use of Violence			1				1
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity		1					1
Placing child out of Soc.						1	1
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements						1	
Reported MOU						1	1
Totals	31	40	22	16	12	26	147
Confessed MOU					2	2	4

Core Sound MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	2	11	12	2			27
Slavery		1					1
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society	3		1				4
Removal	1						1
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated	7	2	3	6			18
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate				1			1
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU			2	1			3
Totals	13	14	18	10			55
Confessed MOU							

Contentnea MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	14	38	24	23	2	5	106
Slavery		1			1		2
Lack of Plainness	1						1
Gross Language							
Joining another Society	3	2	1	3	1	2	12
Removal		4		1			5
Military Actions					3	1	4
Cause not Stated	12	20	29	12	7	7	87
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts	1						1
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	1					1	2
Totals	32	65	54	39	14	16	220
Confessed MOU			5		9	8	22

Neuse MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage						3	3
Slavery						1	1
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal							
Military Actions					1		1
Cause not Stated					2	5	7
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU						1	1
Totals					3	10	13
Confessed MOU					2	3	5

Cane Creek MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	83	58	45	5	8	18	217
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society			1				1
Removal	1		1				2
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated	31	31	26	35	26	6	155
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	9	5	9	12	11	11	57
Totals	124	94	82	52	45	35	432
Confessed MOU	20	10	2	4	10	4	50

Spring MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	13	14	6	11	6	1	51
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society				3	1	1	5
Removal					2		2
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated	4	4	13	1	4	2	28
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate				2			2
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	1	1	2	3	2	1	10
Totals	18	19	21	20	15	5	98
Confessed MOU	2	7	6	8	7	10	43

(1818-1860) Holly Springs MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage			24	16	8	3	51
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness				2		2	4
Gross Language							
Joining another Society			2	2		4	8
Removal							
Military Actions				7	1	1	9
Cause not Stated			4	3	3	2	12
Quarrels or Disputes						2	2
Neglect of Meeting				1	2	1	4
Unsettled debts							
Diversions			1				1
Suits at Law vs. Friends					1		1
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage			1	1	1		3
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct			1				1
Use of Violence				2			2
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity			1				1
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it			2				2
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements			1				1
Reported MOU						1	1
Totals			37	34	16	16	103
Confessed MOU			7	10		12	40

New Garden MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	52	67	23	23	19	18	202
Slavery	3						3
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal	2		2	2	2		8
Military Actions	1						1
Cause not Stated	37	27	26	20	32	18	160
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	5	6	1	1	1	5	19
Totals	100	180	52	46	54	41	393
Confessed MOU	20	40	28	9	20	8	125

Dover (1805-1860) MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage		3	12	14	10	4	43
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal							
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated		4	10	13	14	7	48
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU		3	10	10	7	9	39
Totals		10	32	37	31	20	130
Confessed MOU							

(1818-1849) Hopewell MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage			7	7	8		22
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal				1			1
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated			4	9	13		26
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU			4	10	9		23
Totals			15	27	30		72
Confessed MOU			10	11	15		36

Center (1825-1860) MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage			4	16	28	17	65
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal					3		3
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated			2	14	13	5	34
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU						1	1
Totals			6	30	44	23	103
Confessed MOU			2	16	5	7	30

Back Creek MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	44	39	9	10	8	6	116
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal	1					2	3
Military Actions		1					1
Cause not Stated	31	29	26	17	16	6	125
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	14	13	18	17	20	15	97
Totals	90	82	53	44	44	29	342
Confessed MOU	3						3

Marlboro (1816-1860) MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage		3	9	15	10	8	45
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society			1				1
Removal							
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated		6	20	20	13	4	63
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate				1			1
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU		1					1
Totals		10	30	36	23	12	111
Confessed MOU		19	18	24	16	31	98

Deep River MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	58	51	29	17	13	16	184
Slavery		1					1
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society		1		1		4	6
Removal	2	1	2				5
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated	43	27	25	17	17	8	137
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting					1		1
Unsettled debts					1		1
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate					1		1
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	3	3				3	9
Totals	106	84	56	35	33	31	345
Confessed MOU	13	12	19	11	13	13	81

Springfield MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	21	47	17	16	29	23	153
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society				2	2		4
Removal			1	1		1	3
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated	15	17	29	19	30	25	135
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts				1			1
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate				1	1		2
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU			1	4	2	4	11
Totals	36	64	48	44	64	53	309
Confessed MOU	31	7	37	32	14	39	160

Union 1818-1834 MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage			16	4			20
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal							
Military Actions							
Cause not Stated			22	6			28
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU							
Totals			38	10			48
Confessed MOU							

Westfield 1800-1832 MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	7	4	1				12
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society							
Removal	1						1
Military Actions		5					5
Cause not Stated	38	19	4				61
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD							
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU							
Totals	46	28	5				79
Confessed MOU							

Deep Creek MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	41	66	27	15	25	15	189
Slavery							
Lack of Plainness							
Gross Language							
Joining another Society		3	2	2			7
Removal	1	3	1		1		6
Military Actions	1	1			1		3
Cause not Stated	34	31	36	24	6	6	137
Quarrels or Disputes							
Neglect of Meeting							
Unsettled debts							
Diversions							
Suits at Law vs. Friends							
Disorderly Conduct							
Attending unauth. Marriage							
Accepting Civil Office							
Not Keeping Principles							
Misconduct							
Use of Violence							
"Patterowling"							
Lack of Unity							
Placing child out of Soc.							
Misuse of Certificate							
Not Producing Certificate							
Failure to Use Certificate							
Jealousy or Causing it							
Making MCD					1		1
Unsupported Statements							
Reported MOU	1		2	1	2		6
Totals	78	104	68	42	36	21	349
Confessed MOU	11	10	17	12	14	14	78

ALL MM	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Marriage	471	516	408	279	219	181	2074
Slavery	27	24	7	12	10	4	84
Lack of Plainness	14	9	5	16	6	3	53
Gross Language	13	7	8	7	2		37
Joining another Society	6	10	12	19	14	21	82
Removal	11	12	8	7	8	3	49
Military Actions	5	10	1	18	10	2	46
Cause not Stated	289	258	302	236	202	112	1399
Quarrels or Disputes	1	2		1		2	6
Neglect of Meeting	24	17	15	14	9	7	86
Unsettled debts	8	2	1	1	1		13
Diversions	9	2	6				17
Suits at Law vs. Friends	1	1			1		3
Disorderly Conduct	5						5
Attending unauth. Marriage	7	7	13	4	1		32
Accepting Civil Office			2		1		3
Not Keeping Principles	1	4	1	1			7
Misconduct		2	2	1			5
Use of Violence		2	1	3			6
"Patterowling"				1			1
Lack of Unity		1		1			2
Placing child out of Soc.						1	1
Misuse of Certificate				1			1
Not Producing Certificate				3	1		4
Failure to Use Certificate				1	1		2
Jealousy or Causing it			2				2
Making MCD					1		1
Unsupported Statements			1				1
Reported MOU	35	32	50	59	54	60	290
Totals	929	918	846	684	541	396	4314
Confessed MOU	101	105	190	147	138	151	832

Disownings, all Monthly Meetings, by Decades.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Tidelands and Coastal Plains area							
Perquimans	90	76	73	81	48	55	423
Pasquotank	83	74	64	43	28	3	295
Sutton's Creek	83	54	72	38			247
Rich Square	31	40	22	16	12	26	147
Core Sound	13	14	18	10			55
Contentnea	32	65	54	39	14	16	220
Neuse					3	10	13
Area Total	331	323	303	227	105	110	1400
Piedmont Area							
Cane Creek	124	94	82	52	45	35	432
Spring	18	19	21	20	15	5	98
Holly Spring			37	34	16	16	103
New Garden	100	100	52	46	54	41	393
Dover		10	32	37	31	20	130
Hopewell			15	27	30		72
Center			6	30	44	23	103
Back Creek	90	82	53	44	44	29	342
Marlboro		10	30	36	23	12	111
Deep River	106	84	56	35	33	31	345
Springfield	36	64	48	44	64	53	309
Union			38	10			48
Area Total	474	463	470	415	399	265	2486
Mountain Area							
Westfield	46	28	5				79
Deep Creek	78	104	68	42	36	21	349
Area Total	124	132	73	42	36	21	428
Grand Total	929	918	846	684	541	396	4314

APPENDIX III

THE MIGRATION

Perquimans 278
Pasquotank 279
Sutton's Creek 280
Rich Square 281
Core Sound 282
Contentnea 283
Neuse 284
Cane Creek 285
Spring 286
Holly Springs 287
New Garden 288
Dover 289
Hopewell 290
Center 291
Back Creek 292
Marlboro 293
Deep River 294
Springfield 295
Union 296
Westfield 297
Deep Creek 298

Migration, by source, all monthly meetings 299

Migration, by destination, all monthly meetings 301

Comparison of disownment and migration 302

Plate No. ____ Perquimans M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	2	28	7	18	3		58
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.		33	18	37	31	34	153
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	2	5	9			1	17
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.						4	4
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	4	66	34	55	34	35	228

Plate No. _____ Pasquotank M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	10	8					18
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.		95	27	44	10	8	184
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration	10	103	27	44	10	8	202
Grand total est. migration							

Plate No. ____ Sutton's Creek M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1835	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.		1					1
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.		116	3	64			183
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration		117	3	64			184

Plate No. ______ Rich Square M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	26	18			2	10	56
" Family Certificates	15	3	7				35
" Est. Family Migration	83	17	39				139
" Est. Total Migration	109	35	39		2	10	195
Indiana Individual Cert.		15	47	8			70
" Family Certificates					2		2
" Est. Family migration					11		11
" Est. total migration		15	47	8	11		81
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	7	1		1	1		10
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration	7	1		1	1		10
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates					1		1
" Est. family migration					6		6
" Est. total migration					6		6
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates						1	1
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						1	1
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	116	51	86	9	20	11	293

Plate No. Core Sound M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	47						47
" Family Certificates	15						15
" Est. Family Migration	83						83
" Est. Total Migration	130						130
Indiana Individual Cert.				86			86
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration				86			86
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	130			86			216

Plate No. ______ Contentnea ______ M.M.	1800- 1809	1810- 1819	1820- 1829	1830- 1839	1840- 1849	1850- 1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	63	16		1			80
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.		21	174	70		13	278
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	1						1
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.			14				14
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates			11		9	5	25
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	64	37	199	71	9	18	398

Plate No. ______ Neuse ____________ M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.						2	2
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration						2	2
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.						1	1
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration						1	1
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration						3	3

Plate No. ______ Cane Creek M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	33	4					37
" Family Certificates	57	2					59
" Est. Family Migration	314	11					325
" Est. Total Migration	347	15					362
Indiana Individual Cert.		46	35	36	28	18	163
" Family Certificates		28	50	40	4	4	126
" Est. Family migration		154	275	220	22	22	693
" Est. total migration		200	310	256	50	40	856
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	1						1
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration	1						1
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	7						7
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration	7						7
Illinois indiv. certs.				1			1
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration				1			1
Kansas indiv. certificates						4	4
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						4	4
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates					1	1	2
" family migration					6	6	12
" total migration					6	6	12
All other indiv. certs.	—						
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	355	215	310	257	56	50	1243

Plate No. _____ Spring M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	7						7
" Family Certificates	4	6					10
" Est. Family Migration	22	33					55
" Est. Total Migration	29	33					62
Indiana Individual Cert.		11	39	58	34	10	152
" Family Certificates		15	17	15	1		48
" Est. Family migration		83	94	83	6		266
" Est. total migration		94	133	141	40	10	418
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates	2						2
" Est. family migration	11						11
" Est. total migration	11						11
Illinois indiv. certs.				1			1
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration				1			1
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates					1		1
" family certificates				1			1
" family migration				6			6
" total migration				6	1		7
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates				2			2
" est. family migration				11			11
" est. total migration				11			11
Grand total est. migration	40	127	133	159	41	10	510

Plate No. Holly Spring M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.			2	7	4	40	53
" Family Certificates			7	18	3	1	29
" Est. Family migration			39	99	17	6	161
" Est. total migration			41	106	21	46	214
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates						13	13
" family certificates						1	1
" family migration						5	5
" total migration						18	18
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration			41	106	21	64	232

Plate No. ______ New Garden M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	51	52	3	1			107
" Family Certificates	49	45	5				99
" Est. Family Migration	259	237	28				524
" Est. Total Migration	310	289	31	1			631
Indiana Individual Cert.		43	46	39	31	37	196
" Family Certificates		36	78	20	8	24	166
" Est. Family migration		198	429	110	44	132	913
" Est. total migration		241	475	149	75	169	1109
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	3	4	1				8
" Family Certificates	3						3
" Est. Family migration	17						17
" Est. total migration	20	4	1				25
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	9						9
" Family certificates		1					1
" Est. family migration		6					6
" Est. total migration	9	6					15
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates						2	2
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						2	2
All other indiv. certs.	3	1			2		6
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration	3	1			2		6
Grand total est. migration	342	541	507	150	77	171	1788

Plate No. _____ Dover M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.		2	5	3	2		12
" Family Certificates		1	2		2		5
" Est. Family Migration		6	11		11		28
" Est. Total Migration		8	16	3	13		40
Indiana Individual Cert.			7	28	7	7	49
" Family Certificates			6	6		3	15
" Est. Family migration			33	33		17	83
" Est. total migration			40	61	7	24	132
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates						1	1
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						1	1
All other indiv. certs.			1				1
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							1
Grand total est. migration		8	57	64	20	25	174

Plate No. ______ Hopewell M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1824-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.			9	12	10		31
" Family Certificates			9	12	9		30
" Est. Family migration			50	66	50		166
" Est. total migration			59	78	60		197
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration			59	78	60		197

Plate No. ______ Center M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1825-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1859	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.							
" Family Certificates				1			1
" Est. Family Migration				6			6
" Est. Total Migration				6			6
Indiana Individual Cert.			8	7	4	12	31
" Family Certificates			11	27	10	15	63
" Est. Family migration			61	149	55	83	348
" Est. total migration			69	156	59	95	379
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates						2	2
" family certificates						3	3
" family migration						18	18
" total migration						20	20
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration			69	162	59	115	405

Plate No. ____ Back Creek M.M.	1800- 1809	1810- 1819	1820- 1829	1830- 1839	1840- 1849	1850- 1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	104	3					107
" Family Certificates	13	4					17
" Est. Family Migration	72	22					94
" Est. Total Migration	176	25					201
Indiana Individual Cert.		65	108	110	23	16	322
" Family Certificates		31	7	4		3	45
" Est. Family migration		171	39	22		17	249
" Est. total migration		236	147	132	23	33	571
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	5			11			16
" Family certificates	1						1
" Est. family migration	6						6
" Est. total migration	11			11			22
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates						8	8
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						8	8
Iowa indiv. certificates						11	11
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						11	11
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	187	261	147	143	23	52	813

Plate No. _____ Marlboro M.M.	1800-1809	1816-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family Migration							
" Est. Total Migration							
Indiana Individual Cert.		4	10	60	11	11	96
" Family Certificates		13	3	33	3	11	63
" Est. Family migration		72	17	182	17	61	349
" Est. total migration		76	27	242	28	72	445
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration		76	27	242	28	72	445

Plate No. ______ Deep River ______ M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	58	27	1	3			89
" Family Certificates	12	5		1			18
" Est. Family Migration	66	28		5			99
" Est. Total Migration	124	55	1	8			188
Indiana Individual Cert.	5	128	54	75	18	16	296
" Family Certificates	1	22	12	17	1	8	61
" Est. Family migration	5	110	66	95	5	55	336
" Est. total migration	10	238	120	170	23	71	632
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	11		1				12
" Family Certificates	1						1
" Est. Family migration	5						5
" Est. total migration	16		1				17
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	6	7				2	15
" Family certificates	1	1					2
" Est. family migration	5	5					10
" Est. total migration	11	12				2	25
Illinois indiv. certs.				2			2
" Family certificates				1			1
" Est. family migration				5			5
" Est. total migration				7			7
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates						1	1
" family migration						5	5
" total migration						5	5
All other indiv. certs.	2	1				1	4
" family certificates	2						2
" est. family migration	11						11
" est. total migration	13	1				1	15
Grand total est. migration	174	306	122	185	23	79	889

Plate No. Springfield M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	46	2	1	1		1	51
" Family Certificates	14	2	1	1			18
" Est. Family Migration	77	11	5	5			98
" Est. Total Migration	123	13	6	6		1	149
Indiana Individual Cert.		18	50	26	1	6	101
" Family Certificates		38	34	34	1	8	115
" Est. Family migration		209	187	187	5	49	637
" Est. total migration		227	237	213	6	55	738
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	18						18
" Family Certificates	3						3
" Est. Family migration	17						17
" Est. total migration	35						35
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	158	240	243	219	6	56	922

Plate No. ______ Union ______ M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1818-1829	1830-1834	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.			2				2
" Family Certificates			4	1			5
" Est. Family Migration			22	5			27
" Est. Total Migration			24	5			29
Indiana Individual Cert.			23	31			54
" Family Certificates			25	14			39
" Est. Family migration			138	77			215
" Est. total migration			161	108			269
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates			2				2
" Est. Family migration			11				11
" Est. total migration			11				11
Tennessee Indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration			196	113			309

Plate No. _____ Westfield M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1832	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	12	10					22
" Family Certificates	4						4
" Est. Family Migration	22						22
" Est. Total Migration	34	10					44
Indiana Individual Cert.		1	4				5
" Family Certificates		1	7				8
" Est. Family migration		5	39				44
" Est. total migration		6	43				49
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	3						3
" Family certificates	3						3
" Est. family migration	18						18
" Est. total migration	21						21
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	55	16	43				114

Plate No. ______ Deep Creek ______ M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	48	28	3	1			80
" Family Certificates	14	14	3				31
" Est. Family Migration	77	77	18				172
" Est. Total Migration	125	105	21	1			252
Indiana Individual Cert.		49	29	34	15	3	130
" Family Certificates		23	17	11	5		56
" Est. Family migration		127	94	61	28		310
" Est. total migration		176	123	95	43	3	440
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.							
" Family Certificates							
" Est. Family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	5	2					7
" Family certificates	3						3
" Est. family migration	17						17
" Est. total migration	22	2					24
Illinois indiv. certs.							
" Family certificates							
" Est. family migration							
" Est. total migration							
Kansas indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
Iowa indiv. certificates							
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration							
All other indiv. certs.							
" family certificates							
" est. family migration							
" est. total migration							
Grand total est. migration	147	283	144	96	43	3	716

Migration, by source, by decades	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Tidelands and Coastal Plan Areas							
Perquimans	4	66	34	55	34	35	226
Pasquotank	10	103	27	44	10	8	202
Suttons Creek		117	3	64			184
Rich Square	116	51	86	9	20	11	293
Core Sound	130			86			216
Contentnea	64	37	199	71	9	18	398
Neuse						3	3
Area Total	324	374	349	324	73	71	1522
Piedmont Area							
Cane Creek	355	215	310	257	56	50	1243
Spring	40	127	133	159	41	10	510
Holly Spring			41	106	21	64	232
New Garden	342	541	507	150	77	171	1788
Dover		8	57	64	20	25	174
Hopewell			59	78	60		197
Center			69	162	59	115	405
Back Creek	187	261	147	143	23	52	813
Marlboro		76	27	242	28	72	445
Deep River	174	306	122	185	23	79	889
Springfield	158	240	243	219	66	56	922
Union			196	113			309

Area Total	1256	1774	1911	1878	414	694	7927
Western Area							
Westfield	55	16	43				114
Deep Creek	147	283	144	96	43	3	716
Area Total	202	299	187	96	43	3	830
Grand Totals	1782	2447	2447	2303	530	770	10279

Plate No. ______ ALL ______________ M.M.	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860	Total
Ohio (incl. SW Pa.) Indiv.	507	199	22	31	8	9	776
" Family Certificates	197	82	22	4	2		307
" Est. Family Migration	1075	442	121	21	11		1672
" Est. Total Migration	1582	641	143	52	19	9	2446
Indiana Individual Cert.	5	645	693	832	227	240	2642
" Family Certificates	1	207	284	251	47	77	868
" Est. Family migration	5	1129	1563	1381	259	424	4761
" Est. total migration	10	1774	2256	2127	486	750	7403
Va. & Md. Indiv. Cert.	43	10	11	1	1	2	68
" Family Certificates	7		2				9
" Est. Family migration	39		11				50
" Est. total migration	82	10	22	1	1	2	118
Tennessee Indiv. certs.	35	9		11		2	57
" Family certificates	10	2			1		13
" Est. family migration	57	11			5		73
" Est. total migration	92	20		11	5	2	130
Illinois indiv. certs.			14	4			18
" Family certificates				1			1
" Est. family migration				5			5
" Est. total migration			14	9			23
Kansas indiv. certificates						12	12
" family certificates							
" family migration							
" total migration						12	12
Iowa indiv. certificates			11		11	37	59
" family certificates				1	1	7	9
" family migration				6	6	39	51
" total migration			11	6	17	76	110
All other indiv. certs.	5	2	1		2	5	15
" family certificates	2			2			4
" est. family migration	11			11			22
" est. total migration	16	2	1	11	2	5	37
Grand total est. migration	1782	2447	2447	2303	530	780	10279

Comparison of Disownment and Migration	Disownings	Migration	Disownings Migration
Tidelands and Coastal Plain area			
Perquimans	423	226	1.85
Pasquotank	295	202	1.46
Sutton's Creek	247	184	1.34
Rich Square	147	293	.51
Core Sound	55	216	.25
Contentnea	220	398	.55
Neuse	13	3	.23
Area Totals	1400	1522	.92
Piedmont Area			
Cane Creek	432	1243	.32
Spring	98	510	.19
Holly Spring	103	232	.44
New Garden	393	1788	.22
Dover	130	174	.75
Hopewell	72	197	.37
Center	103	405	.25
Back Creek	432	813	.53
Marlboro	111	445	.25
Deep River	349	889	.39
Springfield 2	309	922	.34
Union	48	309	.16

Area Totals	2486	7927	.31
Western Area			
Westfield	79	114	.69
Deep Creek	349	716	.49
Area Totals	428	830	.52
Grand Totals	4314	10279	.41

APPENDIX IV

DISCIPLINARY CASES IN BAPTIST CHURCHES

Red Bank Baptist Church

DATE	NAME	CHARGE	DISPOSITION
Sept. 1800	Judith Bentley	Leaving Church meeting	Excluded
Sept. 1800	Donna Fulford	Anger	Excluded
Mar. 1801	Bro. David (N)	Quarreling	Excluded
Mar. 1801	Sister Marcia (N)	Quarreling	Excluded
May, 1801	Elizabeth Adams	Non-attendance	Excluded
May 1801	Tabitha Abriton	Non-attendance	Excluded
Nov. 1801	Ann Bruer	Bigamy	Excluded
Feb. 1802	Elizabeth Ellis	Permitting dancing	Excluded
Mar. 1802	John Marshall	Non-attendance	Excluded
June, 1802	Bro. Slaughter	Quarreling	Reconciled
June, 1802	Cherry Carse	Quarreling	Reconciled
Oct. 1802	James Hopkins	Lying	Excluded
July 1803	Jim (N)	Disobeying master	Excluded
Oct. 1803	Thom Adams	Fighting	Excluded
July 1804	John Abriton	Fighting	Excluded
Dec. 1804	Abner Smith	Striking a free Negro	Not known
Dec. 1804	Sistern Edwards	Slander	Acquitted
Feb. 1805	Bro. Moore	Lying	Excluded
Sept. 1805	Bro. Tucker	Intoxication	Forgiven

Sept. 1805	Bro. Cherry	Quarreling	Excluded
Sept. 1805	John Sirmane	Fighting	Excluded
Sept. 1805	Names not given	Attending horse-race	Admonished restored
June 1806	Bro. Willis	Allowing gambling and revelling	Excluded
July 1806	Judith Willis	Allowing gamblin and revelling	Excluded
July 1806	Sister Stocks	Traffic in liquor	Restored
Nov. 1806	Bro. Knox	Non-attendance, false accusation	Excluded
Nov. 1806	Sister Eastwood	Hostility	Excluded
Jan. 1807	Bro. Bond	Non-attendance	Excluded
Oct. 1807	Bro. Paramore	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1808	Bro. Nero (N)	Intoxication	Not known
Mar. 1810	Gideon Maye	Non-attendance	Excluded
Jan. 1817	Fanny Serman	Leaving church meeting	Excluded
July 1823	Stephen (N)	Disobeying master	Excluded
Jan. 1824	Elizabeth Maye	Keeping a bad house	Excluded
Apr. 1825	Sister Edwards	Non-communion	Restored
May 1826	Sarah Vanewright	Quarreling	Excluded
May 1826	Samuel Brown	Quarreling	Excluded
Sept. 1826	Surthy Brooks	Intoxication	Unknown
Oct. 1826	Allen Smith	Profanity	Excluded
Dec. 1826	Kate (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
Feb. 1837	Bro. Page	Selling liquor on the Sabbath	Excluded
Oct. 1837	Jesse Tece	Joining another church	Excluded
Oct. 1838	Tony (N)	Trespass	Excluded
Oct. 1846	Wiley (N)	Stealing	Excluded
June 1850	Phany (N)	Adultery	Excluded

Oct. 1850	Sarrah Haddick	Joining another church	Excluded
Dec. 1850	Bro. Page	Non-attendance	Restored
Jan. 1852	Azariah Page	Non-attendance	Excluded
June 1855	Edmon Evins	Non-attendance	Excluded
Oct. 1856	Wiley (N)	Theft	Restored
June 1857	John Edwards	Quarreling	Excluded

First Baptist Church, Fayetteville

Mar. 1848	Owen Lackey	Dancing	Excluded
June 1848	DuPre Decker	Forgery	Excluded
June 1848	C. W. Hall	Fighting	Excused
June 1848	James Bruce, Jr.	Visiting house of ill fame	Excluded
June 1848	Maggy Baldwin	Dancing	Excluded
June 1848	Name not given	Dancing	Excluded
June 1848	Name not given	Dancing	Excluded
June 1848	Name not given	Dancing	Excluded
June 1848	Name not given	Dancing	Excluded
Sept. 1848	Joseph McDonald	Attending circus	Restored
Sept. 1848	T. R. Underwood	Attending circus	Restored
Dec. 1848	Datus Jones	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Aug. 1849	Daniel Phillips	Dancing	Excluded
Oct. 1850	Elijah Piners	Adultery	Excluded
May 1851	S. Decker	Fighting	Restored
May 1851	H. Driver	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Feb. 1853	William Watson	Traffic in Spirits	Excluded
June 1853	Emily Hall	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1853	W. R. Sekes	Habitual intoxication, cards	Excluded

Oct. 1853	Samuel Phillips	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Oct. 1853	Thomas Anderson	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Feb. 1854	Alfred Lawson	Adultery	Excluded
May 1854	Calvin Atherson	Intoxication abuse of wife	Restored
May 1854	Bro. Reardon	Mistreatment of wife	Excluded
June 1854	Bro. Davis	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Sept. 1854	William Watson	Traffic in Spirits	Excluded
Oct. 1854	Noah Jordan	Gross immorality	Excluded
Nov. 1854	James McDaniel	Immorality	Excluded
Dec. 1854	Sister Jordan	Gross Immorality	Excluded
Dec. 1854	Brother Rouse	Traffic in Spirits	Restored
Dec. 1854	Ben Rance	Selling a man	Excluded
Jan. 1855	Archie Holms	Immorality	Excluded
Apr. 1855	George New	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Apr. 1855	Elisha Hodges	Joining Free Will Baptist	Excluded
Apr. 1855	Alex Turner	Joining the Free Will Baptists	Excluded
May 1855	William L. Callais	Joining the Methodists	Excluded
Aug. 1855	R. C. Massey	Traffic in liquor	Not stated
Aug. 1855	Richard Watson	Traffic in liquor	Excluded
Nov. 1855	J. G. Avery	Communed with the Presbyterians	Excused
Dec. 1855	T. R. Underwood	Profanity	Restored
Mar. 1856	Sarah Jones	Adultery	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Reuben Jones	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Apr. 1856	Jackson Davis	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
May 1856	G. L. Jonson, Jr.	Profanity	Restored
June 1856	J. G. Avery	Debts, playing cards	Restored

July 1856	Moore Killihan	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1856	Salem Jones	Habitual intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1856	Samuel Faircloth	Traffic in spirits, Profanity	Excluded
Nov. 1856	W. C. Moore	Mistreating Negroes	Excluded
Nov. 1856	David Powell	Mistreating Negroes	Restored
Dec. 1856	Richard Williams	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Jan. 1857	Bro. Powell	Perjury	Excluded
Feb. 1857	Arch. Holmes	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Apr. 1857	Thomas Gill, Jr.	Intoxication	Restored
June 1857	John Kennedy	Intoxication	Restored
June 1857	Thomas Gill, Jr.	Intoxication	Excluded
June 1857	T. J. Jonson, Jr.	Hard talk	Excluded
July 1857	T. J. Jonson, Sr.	Profanity	Restored
Aug. 1857	Henry Strickland	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Nov. 1857	G. L. Jonson	Profnity	Excused
May 1858	John Kennedy	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1858	Bro. Register	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Mar. 1858	Davis Reynolds	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
May 1858	Joseph Avery	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
May 1858	W. C. Elam	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1858	Eliza Bradley	Lewdness	Excluded
Nov. 1858	John Newell	Traffic in spirits	Excluded
Nov. 1859	William Bolden	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1859	Thomas Powers	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1859	W. J. Atkinson	Intoxication	Excluded
June 1860	Benjamin Russell	Traffic in spirits	Excluded

Hepzibah Baptist Church

Aug. 1810	Reuben Jordan	Adultery	Excluded
Jan. 1813	Charlot Horn	Disorderly living	Excluded
June 1813	Lee Winter	Slander	Excluded
Feb. 1813	Lucy (N)	Adultery	Excluded
July 1813	William Fowler	Intoxication	Excluded
July 1814	Neiger (N)	Profanity	Excluded
Aug. 1814	Polly Jordan	Fornication	Excluded
Feb. 1815	Lee Wilder	Non-attendance	Excluded
July 1815	William Fowler	Libel	Reconciled
Sept. 1815	Dees (N)	Concealing stolen goods	Excluded
Nov. 1815	Jeffry (N)	Running away	Excluded
Nov. 1815	William Fowler	Fighting	Excluded
Jan. 1816	George (N)	Running away	Excluded
Mar. 1816	George (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Apr. 1816	Horton Gay	Lying	Restored
Sept. 1816	Polly Wilder	Non-attendance	Excluded
Dec. 1816	Horton Gay	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Feb. 1818	Tony Rhodes	Intodication, dancing	Restored
June 1819	Dinah (N)	Theft	Unknown
Mar. 1820	Dily Barous	Theft	Excluded
Apr. 1820	Clay (N)	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1820	Rachel Pierce	Profanity	Restored
Sept. 1820	Hardy (N)	Intoxication, Lying	Excluded
Sept. 1820	Ephraim (N)	Concealing cotton, lying	Excluded
Nov. 1820	Sally Frank	Slander	Restored

Nov. 1821	William Masse	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1821	Ben (N)	Adultery profanity	Excluded
Feb. 1822	Elizabeth Potter	Fornication	Restored
Feb. 1822	Benjamin Hicks	Intoxication, quarreling disorderly	Excluded
Mar. 1822	Mrs. Hicks	Same as above	Excluded
Feb. 1822	Lac Robertson	Beating his wife	Restored
Mar. 1822	Rached Pierce	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1823	Jeffry (N)	Adultery, beating his wife	Unknown
Mar. 1824	Bro. Durkins	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1824	Ben (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1824	"Servant of Wm. Hobs:	Selling liquor at time of service	Unknown
June 1824	Nancy Woods	Fornication, lying	Excluded
June 1824	Jeffry (N)	Disobeying master	Excluded
June 1824	Frank (N)	Running away	Excluded
June, 1824	Ben (N)	Running away	Restored
Sept. 1824	Diner (N)	Fighting	Unknown
Oct. 1824	Willis Roads	Fornication	Excluded
Oct. 1824	Allen (N)	Theft	Excluded
Marc. 1825	John Henge	Lying	Excluded
May 1825	Benjamin Fason	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1825	Berry Fount	Lying	Excluded
Aug. 1825	Ginny (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Sept. 1825	William Cole	Intoxication	Excluded
Oct. 1825	Benjamin Higgs	Intoxication, lying	Excluded
Nov. 1825	Joseph Shaw	Non-attendance, intoxication	Excluded
Feb. 1825	Wiley Chambers	Intoxication	Excluded

Mar. 1826	Name not given	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1826	Name not given	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1826	Name not given	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1826	Randy (N)	Theft, lying	Excluded
July 1826	John Dunn	Intoxication	Excluded
July 1826	Ben (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Aug. 1826	Mary Griffin	Visit with criminal purpose	Excluded
Aug. 1826	Jeremiah Rhodes	Criminal visit	Restored
Aug. 1826	Ginna (N)	Lying	Excluded
Aug. 1826	Jacob (N)	Disobeying master, running away	Excluded
Sept. 1826	Mason Cole	Fornication	Excluded
Nov. 1826	Jordan (N)	Dancing, fighting	Restored
Jan. 1827	Frank (N)	Preaching without Permission	Restored
Jan. 1827	Chaney (N)	Fornication lying	Restored
Mar. 1827	Greene Honeycutt	Intoxication	Case dismissed
Mar. 1827	Neal Strickland	Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Apr. 1827	Rebecca Chambers	Lying	Excluded
Aug. 1827	Chaney (N)	Fornication, Lying	Excluded
Sept. 1828	Chaney (N)	Fornication, lying	Excluded
Octo. 1828	Martha Bunch	Sheltering a run-away	Excluded
Oct. 1828	Benah (N)	Stealing	Excluded
Aug. 1829	Tabitha Higgs	Profanity	Excluded
Aug. 1829	Patience (N)	Dancing	Unknown
Aug. 1829	Susan (N)	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Feb. 1830	Barry Horton	Slander, lying	Restored
Aug. 1830	Bummer (N)	Theft, lying	Excluded

Nov. 1830	Jordan (N)	Adultery	Restored
May 1832	Zelphy (N)	Adultery	Unknown
May, 1831	Salisbury Manor	Profanity	Excluded
Aug. 1831	Austin (N)	Adultery	Restored
Sept. 1831	Paul Farrel	Lying	Restored
Oct. 1831	Henry Burns	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1831	Jesse Durkins	Slander	Excluded
Feb. 1832	Joseph Brown	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1832	Austin (N)	Running away	Restored
Mar. 1832	Ephraim (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Apr. 1832	Barry Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
Aug. 1832	Jack (N)	Lying	Excluded
Jan. 1833	Alsey Parish	Intoxication dancing	Excluded
Feb. 1833	Hezekiah Massey	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1833	Willis Privett	Theft	Excluded
Mar. 1833	Mary Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1833	Sadie (N)	Unmarried pregnancy	Excluded
Mar. 1833	Becky (N)	Abortion	Excluded
Mar. 1833	Becky's mother (N)	Aiding abortion	Excluded
May 1833	Bennett Pendergraph	Shooting neighbor's mare	Restored
July 1833	Phogan (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Aug. 1833	Barry Brown	Blasphemy	Excluded
Oct. 1833	Rachel Arnold	Lying	Excluded
Dec. 1833	Chloe (N)	Lying, Theft	Excluded
Mar. 1834	Nancy Todd	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1834	Bro. Pierce	Intoxication	Excluded
Aug. 1834	Bro. Woodard	Lying	Excluded

Jan. 1835	Beem (N)	Theft	Unknown
Feb. 1835	Bryan Ferrel	Intoxication	Excluded
July 1835	Jesse Brown	Intoxication	Restored
Sept. 1835	Penny Richardson	Lying	Unknown
Oct. 1835	Lucy (N)	Lying	Restored
Nov. 1835	Willis (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1835	Preas Burns	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1835	Clem Burns	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1835	William Brown	Theft	Excluded
Dec. 1835	Isham (N)	Dancing	Excluded
Feb. 1836	Herrin Burns	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1836	Darcy Bagwell	Horce-racing	Excluded
May 1836	Lucy (N)	Adultery	Excluded
May 1836	Ryan Burns	Fighting	Excluded
June 1836	Caswell Hood	Intoxication	Restored
June 1836	Antonet (N)	Killing her child	Excluded
Nov. 1836	Greene Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1837	Quilla Pendergraph	Profanity	Excluded
Nov. 1837	Edmond Jones	Deserting family	Case dismissed
Nov. 1837	Conwehl Hood	Chasing Negro women at night	Excluded
Aug. 1838	Nathaniel Bagwell	Intoxication	Restored
June 1839	Samuel Strickland	Intoxication	Restored
June 1839	Ryan Burns	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1839	Solomon Brown	Fornication	Excluded
May 1840	Anderson Parrish	Lying	Excluded
June 1840	Thomas Hubbard	Intoxication	Excluded
July 1840	Samuel Strickland	Fornication	Restored

Aug. 1840	Essex (N)	Lying, running away	Excluded
Sept. 1840	Ira J. Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1841	Sister Jordan	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1841	George Burns	Intoxication dancing	Excluded
Sept. 1841	Needham Robertson	Profanity intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1841	James Farrell	Suing a brother	Restored
Jan. 1842	Dossy Bridges	Denied his name	Excluded
Feb. 1842	William Carpenter	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1842	Dick (N)	Intoxication	Restored
May 1842	Lydia Powell	Fornication	Acquitted
June 1842	William Carpenter	Accessory to Bridges	Excluded
July 1842	Ellen (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1842	Elizabeth Parrish	Adultery	Excluded
Sept. 1842	Elizabeth Culpepper	Lying	Excluded
Oct. 1842	William Ellis	Libel against the Church	Restored
Nov. 1842	Charlot (N)	Theft, adultery	Unknown
Nov. 1842	Kitty (N)	Helping Charlot	Unknown
Nov. 1842	Owen Burns	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1842	Patsy (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1842	Mary (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Nov. 1842	Joseph Bagwell	Libel against the Church	Excluded
Jan. 1843	Ransom Lee	Intoxication	Acquitted
Apr. 1843	Jonathan Jordan	Fornication	Excluded
May 1843	Nathaniel Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1843	Isaac (N)	Theft	Excluded
Sept. 1843	Peter (N)	Theft	Excluded
Sept. 1843	Balen (N)	Theft	Case dismissed

Sept. 1843	Angee (N)	Theft	Unknown
Nov. 1843	Angee (N)	Lying	Excluded
Nov. 1843	Isham (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1843	James Ferrel	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1843	Lucy (N)	Concealing goods	Excluded
May 1844	Meggy (N)	Fornication	Excluded
May 1844	Burchat (N)	Adultery	Excluded
July 1844	Caesar (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1844	Minerva Ducke	Adultery	Excluded
Nov. 1844	Clem Burns	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1844	Ransom Lee	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1844	Ira Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1845	Temperance Manor	Fornication	Excluded
July 1845	William Horton	Fighting	Excluded
Aug. 1845	Calvin Duncan (N)	Lying	Excluded
Dec. 1845	Is (N)	Theft	Excluded
Dec. 1845	Ben (N)	Theft	Excluded
Dec. 1845	Eliza (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Jan. 1846	Gilbert Parish	Fiddling, Dancing	Excluded
Mar. 1846	Solomon (N)	Fighting	Excluded
Mar. 1846	Wesley Hill	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Mar. 1846	Jesse Wheeler	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1846	Inos Rhodes	Non-attendance, allowing dancing	Excluded
Apr. 1846	James Stably	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
May 1846	Mary Tucker	Fornication	Excluded
Oct. 1846	Peggy Morgan (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1846	Ino Arnold	Intoxication	Excluded

Feb. 1847	Dick (N)	Fighting	Unknown
Feb. 1847	Mary (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Feb. 1847	Barry Bagwell	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1847	Burrell (N)	Theft	Excluded
Feb. 1848	Margaret (N)	Fornication	Excluded
May 1848	Martha Rimora	Fornication	Excluded
July 1848	Al Upchurch	Profanity	Excluded
Oct. 1848	Lucy (N)	Fighting	Excluded
Oct. 1848	Owen Burns	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1849	Rebecca Parish	Adultery	Excluded
Apr. 1849	Henry Parker	Slander	Restored
Apr. 1849	Willy Nichols	Slander	Restored
May 1849	Nancy Williams	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1849	Willis Williams	Dancing	Excluded
Jan. 1850	Gibson Pierce	Profanity	Excluded
July 1850	Willie Nichols	Fornication	Excluded
July 1850	Jane Upchurch	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1850	Gressing (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Jan. 1851	John Arnold	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1851	Catherine (N)	Theft	Excluded
July 1851	Emily Upchurch	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1851	John Smith	Intoxication profanity	Excluded
Nov. 1851	Asa Underwood	Intoxication	Excluded
Aug. 1852	Mary Mooneyham	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1852	Harrison Brinkley	Fornication	Excluded
Jan. 1854	Catherine(N)	Disorderly Conduct	Excluded
Jan. 1855	Hardy Ficks	Intoxication	Excluded

Mar. 1855	Salina Ellis	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1855	Mary Parish	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1855	Willa Williams	Dancing, cards	Excluded
Dec. 1856	Mary Hubbard	Fornication	Excluded
Dec. 1856	Willis (N)	Lying	Excluded
Dec. 1856	Jim (N)	Lying	Excluded
Dec. 1856	Elec (N)	Lying	Excluded
Aug. 1857	W. H. Lee	Intoxication	Excluded
Aug. 1857	John R. Todd	Intoxication	Excluded
Oct. 1857	Nancy Parish	Fornication	Excluded
Oct. 1857	Susan (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Dec. 1857	Greene (N)	Theft	Excluded
Dec. 1857	C. J. Parich	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1858	William W. Wood	Dancing, intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1858	Joseph Hubbard	Dancing, intoxication	Excluded
June 1858	Carolina (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Mar. 1859	Joseph Laton	Trading in Negroes	Excluded
Nov. 1859	S. H. Hood	Trading in spirits	Excluded
Feb. 1860	Willis Ellis	Retailing spirits	Excluded
Mar. 1860	Witham Strickland	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1860	Thomas Pullen	Intoxication	Excluded
	First Baptist Church, Raleigh		
June 1823	Sister Johnson	Non-attendance	Excluded
July 1823	Mabel Person	Disorder	Excluded
May 1824	Joseph Powell	Intoxication	Excluded
Jan. 1826	Sister Dodd	Not stated	Excluded
May 1827	Clayborn (N)	Intoxication, mayhem	Suspended 3 months

July 1801	John Burch	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1802	Betsy Davis	Undue familiarity	Restored
July 1802	W. Wilson	Beating his wife	Restored
Feb. 1803	Betsy Davis	Undue familiarity	Excluded
May 1803	Peter (N)	Bigamy	Excluded
May 1803	Bro. Brooks	Theft	Excluded
Aug. 1803	Bro. Wilkinson	Fighting	Restored
Sept. 1803	Charlotte (N)	Bigamy	Excluded
Dec. 1803	William Malone	Fighting	Restored
Jan. 1804	John Fowler	Intoxication –	Excluded
May 1804	Baylor Burch	Kissing neighbor's wife	Excluded
May 1804	Suzanna Clayton	Being kissed	Excluded
June 1804	John Price	Disorderly conduct	Restored
July 1804	"The Sisters Minires"	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Oct. 1804	William Malone	Fraud	Excluded
Dec. 1804	Bro. Hawkins	Communing with Methodists	Excluded
Dec. 1804	Bro. Maddin	Improper language	Restored
Jan. 1805	Bro. Wheeler	Anger, ill words	Restored
Feb. 1805	Bro. Wilkinson	Improper conduct	Excluded
June. 1805	Daniel Malone	Anger	Restored
Sept. 1805	Daniel Malone	Anger	Restored
Sept. 1805	Isaac Rainey	Dispute	Reconciled
Sept. 1805	Daniel Malone	Dispute	Reconciled
Sept. 1805	John Attic	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1805	Thomas Price	Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Apr. 1806	John Price	Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Sept. 1806	James Lemmer	Anger	Restored

Dec. 1827	J. L. Turner	Adultery	Excluded
Mar. 1829	Rebecca Saunders	Intoxication	Unknown
May 1830	Sister Nicholson	Anger	Restored
Aug. 1830	Sister Johnson	Slander	Excluded
Sept. 1850	Sister Davis	Quarrelling	Excluded
May 1831	Allan Lunsford	Fighting	Excluded
Oct. 1831	Elizabeth Wedding	Having children sprinkled	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Hesse (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Name not given (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Name not given (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Name not given (N)	Theft	Excluded
May 1832	William Buffalo	Non-attendance	Excluded
Aug. 1840	Sister Stone	Non-attendance	Restored
Feb. 1840	Turner Curter	Fighting	Unknown
June 1843	Sarah Turner	Gross Misconduct	Excluded
Dec. 1843	D. H. Holland	Non-attendance	Restored
Mar. 1846	Joseph Hawkins	Gross immorality	Suspended 6 months
Apr. 1846	Thomas Parliam	Schism	Excluded
Apr. 1849	J. G. Buffalo	Speculating in Negroes	Excluded
May 1849	William Williams	Unbecoming conduct	Excluded
May 1849	Quentin Tittry	Unbecoming conduct	Excluded
June 1851	A. J. Corder	Sale of liquor	Unknown
Dec. 1854	Bro. Betts	Unbecoming conduct	Excluded
Dec. 1854	Bro. Barry	Unbecoming conduct	Excluded
Dec. 1854	Bro. Harrup	Unbecoming conduct	Excluded
Feb. 1855	Edward Fowlkes	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1858	Isiah Perry	Intoxication, profanity	Suspended 3 months

May 1858	T. H. Belvin	Intoxication	Restored
July 1858	Mrs. Lugger	Infidelity	Unknown
Sept. 1858	Elias Legon	Assault	Suspended 3 months
Sept. 1858	Bro. Van Brusen	Assault	Excluded
Nov. 1858	John Wood	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1858	T. H. Belvin	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1858	Mary Muller Brown	Fornication (child after marriage)	Excluded
Dec. 1858	W. R. Blake	Profanity	Excluded
Dec. 1858	Jordan Carter	Disorder (badges on clothing during church)	Admonished
Dec. 1858	Alsay Crocker	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1858	John Crabtree	Intoxication	Acquitted
Dec. 1858	Sarah Williams	Joining another church	Excluded
Apr. 1859	D. C. Dudley	Intoxication	Restored
Sept. 1859	John Tucker	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Sept. 1859	R. P. Williams	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1859	Elizabeth Parham	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1859	Jordan Carter	Intoxication, neglect of duty	Restored
Mar. 1860	Bro. Kirkham	Non-attendance	Restored
Mar. 1860	John Crop	Joined another church	Excluded
Mar. 1860	Mary Crop	Joined another church	Excluded
Mar. 1860	Joseph Stephens	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
Nov. 1860	Joseph Perry	Notorious behavior	Excluded
Nov. 1860	Mary Ann Perry	Notorious behavior	Excluded

Wheeley's Baptist Church

Oct. 1800	Bro. Eubank	Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Feb. 1801	Janie (N)	Fornication	Restored
May 1801	Richard Burch, Jr.	Gambling	Excluded

Oct. 1806	Joshua Step	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1806	Thomas Keeing	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1807	John Price	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
July 1807	Sister Ray	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Oct. 1807	Bro. Whitefield	Anger	Restored
Dec. 1807	Bro. Heigh	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1808	Bro. Rainey	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1808	Thomas Rimmer	Anger	Restored
Oct. 1808	Joshua Step	Disorderly conduct	Restored
Jan. 1809	Joshua Step	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1809	Dick (N)	Disorder	Restored
Oct. 1809	Daniel Malone	Dispute	Reconciled
Oct. 1809	Bro. Bailey	Dispute	Reconciled
June 1809	John Malone	Fighting	Restored
Nov. 1809	Thomas Rimmer	Anger	Restored
Nov. 1809	Stephen Ellis	Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Nov. 1809	William Keeling	Anger	Restored
Nov. 1809	William Whitfield	intoxication Anger	Excluded
Nov. 1809	Dan Malone	Anger	Restored
Dec. 1809	John Malone	Anger	Restored
July 1810	Thomas Keeling	Anger	Restored
July 1810	Thomas Rimmer	Anger	Restored
July 1810	William Keeling	Intoxication	Excluded
Oct. 1810	Thomas Rimmer	Intoxication	Unknown
May 1811	John Malone	Intoxication	Restored
May 1811	James Keeling	Non-attendance	Excluded
July 1811	Dick (N)	Keeping company	Excluded

Aug. 1811	John Malone	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1811	Caleb Gacombs	Anger	Re Restored
Feb. 1812	Caleb Gacombs	Anger	Restored
Apr. 1812	Thomas Rimmer	Fighting, non-attendance	Excluded
Apr. 1812	James Broach	Quarrel	Settled
Apr. 1812	Thomas Burch	Quarrel	Settled
Oct. 1812	Bro. Blalock	Anger, assault	Restored
Nov. 1813	Bro. Blalock	Fighting	Restored
Dec. 1813	Bro. Blalock	Horse-trading	Restored
Jan. 1814	John Burch	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1814	Bro. Rainey	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1814	Alexander Malone	Intoxication, fighting	Restored
May 1814	Duke (N)	Disorder	Excluded
Sept. 1814	Caleb Gacombs	Fighting, profanity	Acquitted
Oct. 1814	Bro. Hargis	Anger, intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1815	John Ellis	Dispute	Restored
Jan. 1815	Elijah Ellis	Anger	Restored
June 1815	Bro. Wheeler	Selling liquor on Sunday to Negroes	Excluded
July 1815	John Blalock	Intoxication, cock-fighting	Excluded
Feb. 1816	Bro. Fine	Intoxication	Restored
June 1816	Bro. McKee	Dispute	Reconciled
July 1816	John Ellis	Anger	Restored
July 1816	Elizabeth McNab	Fighting	Excluded
July 1816	Sister Malone	Dispute	Reconciled
July 1816	John Crisps	Dispute	Reconciled
Aug. 1816	Bro. Bowder	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1817	Bob (N)	Anger	Restored

Jan. 1818	A. Ellis	Anger	Restored
June 1818	Dick (N)	Fighting with a white man	Excluded
Aug. 1818	Sister Burch	Dispute	Restored
Aug. 1818	Sister Marshall	Dispute	Excluded
Dec. 1818	Bro. Hargis	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1819	Bro. McKee	Dancing	Restored
Oct. 1819	William Burch	Moved away	Excluded
Oct. 1819	Andy Ellis	Disorder	Restored
Oct. 1819	James Keeling	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1819	Bro. Hargis	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1820	Negro (N)	Pregnant	Excluded
Jan. 1821	Bro. Marshall	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1821	James Burch	Non-attendance	Excluded
Feb. 1821	Bro. Marshall	Debts	Settled
July 1821	Bro. Hargis	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1822	Bro. Woods	Intoxication	Restored
May 1822	Bro. Keeling	Intoxication	Restored
May 1822	Bro. Hargis	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1823	Bro. Marshall	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1823	Bro. Hargis	Disorder	Restored
Nov. 1823	Joseph Hargis	Intoxication	Excluded
Jan. 1824	Bro. Marshall	Anger	Restored
Feb. 1824	Bro. Keeling	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1824	Joshua Horton	Wrestling	Restored
Oct. 1824	Joshua Horton	Anger	Restored
Dec. 1824	R. Roberts	Gambling	Excluded
July 1825	James Whitfield	Intoxication	Restored

Aug. 1825	Joshua Horton	Fighting	Restored
Aug. 1825	John Whitfield	Dispute	Reconciled
Aug. 1825	Mrs. John Whitfield	Dispute	Reconciled
Aug. 1825	Whitfield daughter	Dispute	Reconciled
Aug. 1825	Sister Perry	Dispute	Reconciled
Oct. 1825	Bro. Marshall	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1825	Bro. Crisp	Dispute	Settled
Oct. 1825	Bro. Burch	Dispute	Settled
Oct. 1825	Bro. Stanford	Fighting	Restored
Mar. 1826	Bro. Horton	Dispute	Restored
Mar. 1826	Bro. Whitfield	Dispute	Excluded
Oct. 1826	John Crisp	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1827	Joshua Horton	Non-attendance	Excluded
Mar. 1828	Bro. McKee	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1828	Bro. Blalock	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1828	Bro. Nichols	Intoxication	Restored
July 1829	James Keeling	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1829	James Keeling	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1829	Dick (N)	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1829	Allie Brown	Not stated	Excluded
Nov. 1829	Mollie (N)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1829	Nancy (N)	Theft	Excluded
Mar. 1830	Samuel Cairy	Suing, horse-racing	Excluded
June 1830	"A black brother"	Bastardy	Excluded
July 1830	Bro. Ceyton	Fighting	Restored
Aug. 1830	Betcy Jonson	Disorder	Excluded
Aug. 1830	Bro. Norfleet	False accounts	Acquitted

Aug. 1830	John Tapp	Disorderly house on property	Acquitted
Dec. 1830	John Tapp	Disorder	Acquitted
Nov. 1830	Bro. Keyton	Hostility	Acquitted
Aug. 1830	Minny Whitfield	Damaging property	Acquitted
May 1831	Minny Whitfield	Not stated	Excluded
May 1831	Squire (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Bro. Nelson	Gambling	Excluded
Nov. 1831	Bro. Jones	Gambling, giving a slave a military book	Acquitted
Nov. 1831	Bro. Marshall	Slander	Excluded
Mar. 1832	Bro. Ceyton	Non-attendance	Excluded
Apr. 1832	Bro. Blalock	Intoxication	Restored
June 1832	Biblo Phillips	Selling liquor on the Sabbath	Restored
May 1833	William Mansfield	Anger	Restored
Nov. 1833	Josiah Brown	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1834	Richard Bargis	Wrestling	Restored
Apr. 1834	Dixora Brown	Intoxication	Restored
May 1834	Jeremiah Rimmer	Intoxication	Restored
June 1834	Nancy (N)	Breaking up a marriage	Acquitted
July 1834	Polly Murdock	Too intimate with a man	Acquitted
Jan. 1835	Nancy (N)	Immorality	Excluded
Feb. 1836	Bro. Mansfield	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1836	Bro. Jones	Suing a brother	Restored
May 1836	William Cates	Intoxication	Restored
June 1836	Joseph Brown	Intoxication	Restored
June 1836	Bro. Phillips	Retailing spirits	Restored
Aug. 1836	Rob Blalock	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1836	William Cates	Intoxication	Restored

Nov. 1837	Rob Blalcok	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1837	Jeremiah Rimmer	Abusing Mr. Mason	Acquitted
Nov. 1836	Jeremiah Rimmer	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1836	John Morris	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1838	Richard Hargis	Habitual intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1838	Richard Blalock	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1838	William Brown	Quarrel	Excluded
Apr. 1838	Bro. Phillips	Quarrel	Acquitted
July 1838	William Phillips	Assualt	Excluded
Aug. 1839	Ephraim Hawkes	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1839	Sister Blalock	Permitting dancing	Restored
Apr. 1840	Clayborn Burch	Intoxication	Restored
June 1840	Josiah Brown	Disorder	Excluded
Sept. 1840	Willis Horton	Immorality	Excluded
Apr. 1841	Polly Ray	Pregnancy	Excluded
July 1841	Richard Burch	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1841	Rob Blalock	Intoxication	Restored
Sept. 1841	John Day	Intoxication	Restored
Sept. 1841	William Jones	Fighting	Restored
Oct. 1841	William Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1842	Jeremiah Rimmer	Anger, profanity	Restored
July 1842	Nancy Blalock	Slander	Excluded
Aug. 1842	Rob Blalock	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1842	Shady Hargis	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1844	William Mansfield	Intoxication	Unknown
Oct. 1844	Philip Wheeler	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1835	Jane Lea	Adultery	Excluded

Jan..1846	William Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1846	Jeremiah Rimmer	Intoxication	Excluded
Jan. 1846	Sister E. Phillips	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1846	Grace (N)	Disorder	Restored
July 1846	Sam Horton	Improper conduct	Excluded
July 1846	Martha Alrich	Improper conduct	Excluded
July 1846	Sister McKee	Quarrel	Acquitted
Dec. 1846	John Harkins	Personal abuse	Excluded
Apr. 1847	William Marshall	Intoxication	Excluded
May.1846	Elizabeth Drake	Disorder	Excluded
May 1846	Henrietta Ford	Non-attendance	Excluded
June 1847	Philip Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
July 1847	Susan Whitfield	Had a black child	Excluded
Oct. 1847	James Whitfield	Intoxication	Acquitted
Apr. 1848	Grace (N)	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1848	Robert Malone	Pleasure meeting	Excluded
Aug. 1848	Sidney Obrien	Pleasure meeting	Excluded
Nov. 1848	Richard Broach	Intoxication	Restored
Mar. 1849	E. P. Hester	Intoxication, abusing wife	Acquitted
July 1849	John Smith	Fraud	Excluded
Nov. 1849	Philip Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1850	Bro. Blalock	Gambling	Excluded
June 1855	John Smith	Illegally received into membership	Excluded
Nov. 1855	N. Hester	Unfellowhip over Smith case	Excluded
Aug. 1856	Philip Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1856	Philip Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1857	Philip Wheatly	Intoxication	Excluded

Apr. 1858	Absolam Lee	Selling liquor on the Sabbath	Restored
Aug. 1858	William Wheatly	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1858	Bro. Lee	Fighting, selling liquor on Sabbath	Excluded
Nov. 1858	Frances Lee	Fighting, selling liquor on Sabbath	Excluded

Mt. Pisgah Baptist Church

May 1819	James Wheeler	Lying	Excluded
July 1820	Rebecca Abull	Slander	Excluded
July 1820	Sister Martin	Anger	Excluded
Feb. 1821	Ada Wheeler	Slander	Excluded
Feb. 1821	Holly Sigmons	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Mar. 1821	Asa Barbar	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1821	Nancy Yates	Hostility	Excluded
Nov. 1822	Esther Boyd	Pregnancy	Excluded
Jan. 1823	Henry Cole	Shooting a woman	Excluded
Jan. 1823	Happy Cole	Dancing	Excluded
Feb. 1823	Polly Upchurch	Intoxication	Restored
July 1824	Peggy Yates	Pregnancy	Excluded
July 1824	Jesse Yates	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1824	Celia Dodd	Pregnancy	Excluded
Apr. 1826	George Williams	Hostility	Excluded
Dec. 1826	Elisha Harward	Non-attendance	Excluded
Dec. 1826	Dan (N)	Non-attendance	Excluded
Jan. 1827	George Wilson	Non-attendance	Excluded
Mar. 1827	Bro. Christ	Deserting wife	Excluded
Aug. 1827	Britton Mills	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1827	Brantley Yates	Dancing, "campaigns at night"	Restored
Feb. 1831	Shadrock Cole	Adultery, beating his wife	Excluded

Feb. 1831	Wesley Yates	Moved away	Excluded
Oct. 1831	Millie Cole	Intoxication in church	Excluded
Feb. 1832	Jethro Yates	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1832	Joseph Barbar	Non-attendance	Excluded
June 1832	Willie Turner	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1833	John Regan	Intoxication	Excluded
Feb. 1833	William Fuller	Intoxication	Restored
May 1833	William Fuller	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1833	Sister Ryan	Hostility	Excluded
May 1833	William Fuller	Intoxication	Restored
Oct. 1833	William Fuller	Intoxication	Restored
Nov. 1833	Conny Burgess	Pregnancy	Excluded
Sept. 1836	Polly Rigsby	Moved away	Excluded
Feb. 1837	James Harward	Intoxication, gambling	Excluded
Feb. 1837	Bro. Nelson	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
June 1838	Peggy (N)	Bearing white child	Excluded
Aug. 1839	Verbin Castlebury	Fighting	Restored
June 1840	Elizabeth Yates	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1841	Bro. Booth	Family quarrel	Excluded
Jan. 1841	Mrs. Booth	Family quarrel	Excluded
Feb. 1841	Elizabeth Yates	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1841	Elizabeth Yates	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1841	John Harward	Quarrel	Excluded
Sept. 1841	Mrs. Harward	Quarrel	Excluded
June 1842	Nancy Hudson	Bastardy	Excluded
Jan. 1843	Sister Tiller (N)	Disorder	Restored
Jan. 1844	Ethelburt Ferrel	Intoxication, non-attendance	Restored

Apr. 1844	Dilly Yates	Pregnancy	Excluded
May 1844	Etheburt Ferrel	Theft, lying	Excluded
May 1844	Sister Mills	Neglect of church duties	Excluded
June 1844	William Fuller	Intoxication	Restored
July 1844	William Fuller	Intoxication	Excluded
Feb. 1845	James Parimore	Intoxication-profanity	Excluded
Mar. 1849	Willa Jonson	Not stated	Excluded
Mar. 1845	Lewis Horton	Non-attendance	Excluded
July 1848	Sister Booth	Intoxication	Excluded
June 1849	Peggy (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1843	Mack Barbee	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1854	Robert Council	Non-attendance	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Bro. Lasater	Fornication before marriage	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Mrs. Lasater	Fornication before marriage	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Joseph Scott	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Samantha Scott	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1857	Ruffin Morgan	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1848	M. E. Hendon	Bastardy	Excluded
July 1848	Lemuel Holder	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1858	Albert Scott	Selling liquor	Excluded
Oct. 1858	Nancy Parymore	Hostility, leaving church in disorder	Excluded
Dec. 1858	George Rogers	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Dec. 1858	J. P. Upchurch	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1859	Dillany Mills	Adultery	Excluded
Dec. 1848	Calvin Holden	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1859	Henderson Marcam	Intoxication	Acquitted
Apr. 1859	Thomas Morgan	Profanity	Excluded

July 1859	R. T. Spears	Slander	Excluded
Nov. 1859	Henderson Marcom	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1860	William T. Mitchell	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1860	James (N)	Profanity	Excluded
Mar. 1860	Marey Wimberly	Dancing, selling liquor	Acquitted
Mar. 1860	Ransom Perry	Intoxication	Restored
May 1860	Henry Laten	Intoxication, dancing, cards	Excluded
Nov. 1860	J. R. Whitehead	Dancing	Acquitted
Nov. 1860	F. F. Williams	Cards	Unknown

Jersey Baptist Church

Feb. 1800	Nathan Briggs	Slander	Excluded
May 1881	Elizabeth Davis	Adultery	Excluded
Aug. 1801	Molly Hendrick	Fornication	Excluded
Dec. 1802	George Reed	Quarrel	Reconciled
Dec. 1802	Sister Hunt	Quarrel	Reconciled
June 1804	Mrs. Moses Owens	Leaving husband	Excluded
Nov. 1804	Sarah Miller	Adultery	Excluded
Nov. 1804	Lewis Gilstrap	Non-attendance	Excluded
Feb. 1805	Peter Erinkle	Immorality	Excluded
Apr. 1805	R. D. Hartly	Debts	Settled
Mar. 1806	Mary Williams	Adultery	Excluded
May 1806	Bro. Gallymore	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1806	Lidda Read	Bastardy	Excluded
July 1807	Bro. Marborough	Profanity	Restored
Jan. 1808	David Englar	Quarrel	Suspended
Jan. 1808	Capehart Walling	Quarrel	Suspended
Apr. 1808	T. Smith Hill	Immorality	Excluded

June 1808	Bro. Simpson	Immorality	Suspended
June 1809	Jonathan Wiseman	Leaving Church in disorder	Suspended
Nov. 1809	David Englar	Disorder	Excluded
Dec. 1809	James Patterson	Immorality	Excluded
Feb. 1810	Joseiah (N)	Adultery	Excluded
Feb. 1810	William Ford	Immorality	Excluded
Mar. 1810	Robert Arnold	Adultery	Excluded
Mar. 1810	Reginald Simpson	Intoxication	Excluded
June 1810	Bro. Yarborough	Quarrel	Reconciled
June 1810	Bro. Merrill	Quarrel	Reconciled
Nov. 1810	Nancy Jestis Serat	Adultery	Excluded
Feb. 1811	Mary Richardson	Quarrel	Reconciled
Feb. 1811	Elizabeth Lloyd	Quarrel	Reconciled
Feb. 1812	Jesse Hayden	Disobedience to Church	Excluded
Apr. 1812	Jonathan Merrill	Disobedience to Church	Excluded
Oct. 1812	John Smith	Slander	Acquitted
Oct. 1812	Thomas Durham	False charge	Excluded
Jan. 1813	Henry Yarborough	Immorality	Excluded
Feb. 1813	John Durham	Quarrel	Excluded
Feb. 1813	Lidda Wood	Quarrel	Excluded
July 1814	Ned (n)	Theft	Excluded
Nov. 1815	John Hemby	Immorality	Excluded
Nov. 1815	James Gadbury	Immorality	Excluded
Oct. 1816	R. D. Owen	Quarrel	Reconciled
Dec. 1816	John Park	Quarrel	Reconciled
Apr. 1819	Lidda Wood	Quarrel	Reconciled
Apr. 1819	Hezekiah Owen	Quarrel	Reconciled

Dec. 1819	Louis Robling	Quarrel	Reconciled
Dec. 1819	Zacheus MacAtee	Quarrel	Reconciled
Feb. 1825	Lidda Wood	False Testimony	Excluded
Nov. 1828	Zacheus McAtee	Lying	Excluded
June 1831	Jess (N)	Theft	Excluded
June 1832	Bro. Warford	Intoxication	Suspended
Oct. 1833	Bro. Warford	Intoxication	Excluded
Jan. 1835	John Meyers	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1835	Name not given	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1835	Name not given	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1835	Name not given	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1835	William Williams	Intoxication	Restored
Sept. 1835	Elizabeth Roach	Adultery	Excluded
Feb. 1836	Jess Hayden	Habitual intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1838	Ned (N)	Lying	Excluded
Sept. 1836	John Meyers	Intoxication	Excluded
Jan. 1837	Allan (N)	Adultery	Excluded
May 1837	Phellep (N)	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1837	Levi Camish	Intoxication	Excluded
May 1837	Lucy Moray	Adultery	Excluded
Mar. 1838	Fanny (N)	Adultery	Excluded
June 1838	Dave (N)	Theft	Expelled
June 1838	Name not given (N)	Theft	Suspended
June 1838	Not given (N)	Theft	Suspended
June 1838	Caty (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Jan..1839	Suffy (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Jan. 1839	Zebulen Minor	Slander	Acquitted

Nov. 1839	Vi (N)	Adultery	Restored
Feb. 1840	John Wiseman	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1840	Hester Wood	Fornication	Excluded
May 1840	John Wilson	Joining another church	Excluded
Mar. 1842	Nullie (N)	Theft, concealing stolen goods	Suspended
Sept. 1842	Robert Cox	Adultery	Excluded
Oct. 1842	Mary Cooper	Immorality	Excluded
Apr. 1843	Mary Ellis	Fornication	Excluded
July 1846	Alfred Moray	Immorality	Excluded
Feb. 1851	George (N)	Dancing	Excluded
Feb. 1851	Grace (N)	Dancing	Excluded
Feb. 1851	Ellen (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Feb. 1852	Nancy (N)	Fornication	Excluded E
Aug. 1851	John Cornelisen	Disobedience to the church	Excluded

Island Ford Baptist Church

Aug. 1809	Sally Cook	Uncleanness	Excluded
Feb. 1813	Benjamin Cook	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Mar. 1813	Bro. Martin	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1814	Bro. Cunningham	Anger	Restored
Nov. 1817	Bro. Cunningham	Anger	Restored
Sept. 1826	Martin Ross	Not stated	Excluded
Mar. 1827	Jesse Rouse	Quarrel	Excluded
Mar. 1827	Morning Jenkins	Quarrel	Restored
Nov. 1827	Sister Rouse	Non-fellowship	Refused letter
May 1828	Nancy Benge	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Aug. 1829	Martin McBride	Assault	Excluded
Aug. 1829	Mrs. Martin McBride	Refusal to hear the Church	Restored

Apr. 1833	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1834	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Restored
July 1834	Thomas Wilkes	Profanity	Restored
Mar. 1837	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1838	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1839	Bro. Robinson	Disorder in church	Excluded
Mar. 1839	Bro. Robie	Quarrel	Acquitted
Mar. 1839	Br. McBride	Quarrel	Suspended
June 1839	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1840	Cornelius Woodruff	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1842	Sister Parish	Slander	Excluded
May 1844	James Calloway	Theft	Excluded
June 1844	Burgess Wood	Disorderly conduct	Excluded
Jan. 1845	Gilbert Haul	Non-attendance, leaving church in disorder	Excluded
Apr. 1845	James Richards	Non-fulfillment of contract	Excluded
May 1845	Susanna Calloway	Theft	Letter of dismissal denied
Sept. 1847	Martin Cockeharm	Anger	Restored
Mar. 1848	Bro. Buchanan	Intoxication at church conference	Excluded
May 1848	William Bryan	Open communion	Excluded
Sept. 1848	Rebecca Cavendir	Pregnancy	Excluded
Sept. 1848	Adam Brown	Contempt of church	Excluded
Sept. 1848	Silpher Sims	Pregnancy	Excluded
Jan. 1849	Charlotte Bryan	Open communion	Excluded
Jan. 1849	Pheobe Bryan	Open communion	Excluded
Jan. 1849	Nancy Bryan	Open communion	Excluded
Jan. 1849	Mary May	Fornication	Unfrocked
Feb. 1849	Catherine Casy	Pregnancy	Excluded

Mar. 1850	Vincent Ball	Own request	Excluded
Nov. 1850	James Calloway	Hostility	Excluded
Sept. 1851	Cornelius Woodruff	Contempt of church	Excluded
Oct. 1851	Ruth Ball	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Oct. 1851	Nancy Nichols	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Oct. 1851	James Nichols	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Feb. 1851	Hezekiah Ball	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Jan. 1853	Alexander (N)	Habitual intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1856	Bro. Sprinkle	Non-attendance	Excluded
Jan. 1857	Nancy Spear	Joining another church	Excluded
Apr. 1857	Nead (N)	Non-attendance	Excluded
Oct. 1857	Lidy C. Cavender	Pregnancy	Excluded
Jan. 1858	Joel Walker	Intoxication	Excluded
Mar. 1860	Sister Key	Non-attendance	Excluded

Three Forks Baptist Church

Sept. 1800	Daniel Eggers	Intoxication	Excluded
Nov. 1800	Phoebe Eggers	Hostility	Excluded
Jan. 1801	John Brown	Anger	Restored
Feb. 1801	William Owens	Profanity	Excluded
June 1801	Peter Regan	Intoxication, contempt of church	Excluded
June 1801	Benjamin Greene	Intoxication, profanity	Excluded
July 1801	Rachel Moses	Fornication, contempt of Church	Excluded
July 1801	Samuel Northmen	Lying	Excluded
Dec. 1801	Bro. Pain	Neglect of children	Acquitted
Mar. 1802	Samuel Wilcoxson	Contempt of Church	Excluded
Mar. 1802	Patty Owens	"Dallying during Church service"	Excluded
July 1802	John Brown	Joining the Masons, then denying it	Expelled

Mar. 1803	Marshall Horton	Lying	Excluded
Mar. 1803	Mary Chambers	Pregnancy, contempt of Church	Excluded
Sept. 1803	Benjamin Brown	Withdrawal, contempt of Church	Excluded
Sept. 1804	Elizabeth Hall	Abrupt departure	Excluded
Apr. 1805	John Rice	Refusal to give account of Church funds	Excluded
Apr. 1805	Mrs. John Rice	Support of husband	Excluded
May 1807	James Profitt	Joining Masons	Excluded
Aug. 1811	Jeremiah Greene	Permitting daughter to commit adultery	Excluded
Apr. 1813	Bro. Miller	Slander	Excluded
Jan. 1815	Bro. Hartley	Cheating at mill	Excluded
Apr. 1815	Mrs. Hartley	Unwise talk	Excluded
Jan. 1818	Bro. Hartley	Accepting military commission without consent	Restored
Jan. 1818	Bro. Hartley	Theft, cheating	Excluded
Apr. 1818	Jonathan Boone	Intoxication	Restored
May 1819	Jonathan Boone	Intoxication, non-attendance	Excluded
May 1819	Richard Greene	Theft	Unknown
Feb. 1820	Richard Greene	Fighting	Restored
Feb. 1820	Jesse Boone	Attempted fraud	Settled
Dec. 1822	Sister Hartley	Non-attendance	Excluded
May 1823	Sister Boone	Non-fellowship	Excluded
June 1830	Jesse Coffy	Anger	Restored
July 1832	Sister Clawson	Beating her son	Excluded
Nov. 1833	Bro. Blair	Contempt of church	Excluded
May 1834	Bro. Castle	Intoxication, contempt of church	Excluded
Jan. 1835	Reuben Hartley	Abuse of family	Excluded
Apr. 1835	Jacob Ingraham	Anger, assault	Restored
Jan. 1836	William Norris	Intoxication	Restored

Jan. 1836	Rice Hays	Fornication	Excluded
Apr. 1836	Sally Holdsclair	Lying	Excluded
Apr. 1836	Jornorah Hartley	Non-attendance	Excluded
Mar. 1836	Sister Miller	Fornication	Excluded
Jan. 1837	Jeff. Hartley	Blasphemy	Excluded
Jan. 1836	Bro. Townson	Intoxication, Sabbath-breaking	Restored
Feb. 1836	Jesse Greene	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1836	Jacob Lewis	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1836	Susanna Tanner	Dancing	Excluded
Oct. 1836	Gilbert Hodges	Fighting	Restored
Jan. 1838	John Greene	Intoxication	Restored
May 1828	Bro. Carlton	Intoxication	Restored
June 1838	Peter Townson	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1838	Bro. McCleary	Non-attendance	Excluded
May 1838	Peter Townson	Dancing, intoxication, non-attendance	Excluded
July 1838	William Gragg	Scandalous conduct	Excluded
July 1838	Jimmy Regans	Scandalous conduct	Excluded
July 1838	Susan Gragg	Scandalous conduct	Acquitted
July 1838	Fanny Regans	Scandalous conduct	Acquitted
Nov. 1829	Nancy Baker	Blasphemy, abusing husband	Acquitted
Feb. 1840	William Morris	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1840	Harrison Miller	Anger	Restored
Aug. 1840	Henry Miller	Permitting dancing, contempt of church	Excluded
Apr. 1841	George Matheson	Anger	Restored
Jan. 1842	Minerva Mays	Fornication	Excluded
Sept. 1842	Thomas Shearer	Adultery	Excluded
Mar. 1843	Sally Hodges	Non-attendance	Excluded

Mar. 1843S	Sally Townson	Having children sprinkled	Restored
June 1843	Gilbert Hodges	Anger	Excluded
June 1843	Sister Trebett	Quarrel	Excluded
Apr. 1844	Robert Cook	Refusal of debt	Excluded
Apr. 1844	James Lewis	Non-attendance	Acquitted
June 1844	Jacob Ingraham	Failure to use letter of dismissal	Excluded
Sept. 1844	Nat Critcher	Anger	Restored
Aug. 1845	Jacob Cok	Fighting	Restored
Aug. 1845	Nat Critcher	Intoxication	Restored
Apr. 1846	Hugh Fox	Intoxication	Restored
May 1846	James Mays	Fornication, flight from State	Excluded
July 1847	Elizabeth Allison	Dancing	Excluded
Mar. 1848	Morgan Mays	Profanity, fraud	Excluded
May 1848	William Hartly	Anger	Restored
Aug. 1848	John Greene	Intoxication	Restored
Dec. 1848	Damascus Hodges	Dancing	Restored
Feb. 1849	Michael Cook	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1849	Tomis Triplin	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1849	"John Sherman's black man"	Filthy conduct	Excluded
July 1850	Damascus Hodges	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1851	Benjamin Greene	Intoxication	Restored
July 1851	Adam Cook	Fighting	Acquitted
Aug. 1851	James Lewis	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1852	Damascus Hodges	Dancing	Restored
June 1852	Erwin (N)	Fornication	Excluded
Mar. 1853	Nathaniel Stansbury	Intoxication	Restored
Aug. 1853	Wiley Triplett	Intoxication, fighting	Excluded

Aug. 1853	Charles Hatton	Intoxication	Restored
Jan. 1853	Damascus Hodges	Joining the Sons of Temperance	Excluded
Jan. 1853	Burton Hodges	Joining the Sons of Temperance	Excluded
Dec. 1853	Wriley Jones	Intoxication, disorderly conduct	Excluded
June 1854	Jesse Stansbury	Non-attendance contempt of church	Excluded
Aug. 1854	Eunice Cook	Fornication	Excluded
Aug. 1854	Charles Hatton	Intoxication	Excluded
Dec. 1854	Gilbert Hodges	Intoxication	Acquitted
Dec. 1854	John Cook, Jr.	Fornication	Excluded
Mar. 1855	Robert Munday	Intoxication	Restored
July 1855	Joel Cook	Intoxication	Restored
July 1855	Rufus Stone	Intoxication, profanity	Acquitted
Oct. 1855	Robert Munday	Intoxication, contempt of Church	Excluded
Mar. 1856	Alexander Hartly	Intoxication	Acquitted
Apr. 1856	Mary Brown	Fornication	Excluded
Apr. 1856	Nat. Stansbury	Intoxication	Excluded
July 1856	Abraham Hampton	Intoxication	Acquitted
July 1856	Joel Cook	Intoxication	Excluded
Aug. 1856	William Elrod	Debts	Excluded
Sept. 1856	Rufus Storey	Intoxication	Excluded
Sept. 1856	William Hartly	Intoxication	Excluded
Apr. 1857	William Greene	Intoxication	Acquitted
Mar. 1857	Nancy Baker	Profanity	Excluded
July 1857	Adam Cook	Lying	Acquitted
July 1858	John Hartly	Fornication	Excluded
July 1858	Jesse Stone	Intoxication	Acquitted
Aug. 1858	David Brown	Fighting	Acquitted

Oct. 1858	Thomas Cook	Intoxication	Restored
Feb. 1859	William Hartley	Profanity	Restored
Mar. 1859	Goldston Moody	Non-attendance	Excluded
Mar. 1859	Mary Moon	Joining another church	Excluded
July 1859	Abraham Hampton	Non-attendance profanity	Excluded
Mar. 1860	William Greene	Intoxication	Excluded

APPENDIX V

EXCLUSIONS AND MEMBERSHIP, BAPTIST ASSOCIATIONS

Beulah Association[162]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1837	8	9	364			
1839	8	4	437			
Totals		13	801	6.5	400	1.62
1841	9	4	489			
1842	10	6	574			
1843	10	6	681			
1844	13	7	801			
1845	13	9	1042			
1846	12	13	1089			
1847	16	18	1162			
1848	17	17	1223			
1849	19	22	1219			
Total		102	8281	11.3	931	1.21
1850	19	25	1,329			
1852	21	25	1,460			
1853	21	15	1,579			
1855	23	22	1,535			
1856	22	19	1,549			
1857	21	20	1,554			
1858	23	12	1,330			
1859	26	18	1,401			
1860	26	11	1,738			
Totals		177	14,445	19.6	1,496	1.21

---

[162] North Carolina Baptist Associations, Beulah Association, Minutes, 1837-1859, passim. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Brier Creek Association[163]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1825	14	13	665			
1828	16	8	725			
1829	15	12	799			
Totals		33	2,189	11	720	1.53
1831	13	5	712			
1833	14	12	766			
1834	13	12	755			
Totals		29	2,233	10	744	1.33
18						
1845	16	9	686			
1846	17	7	760			
1847	18	19	1,135			
1848	19	24	1,384			
1849	16	18	1,161			
Totals		77	5,126	15.4	1,025	1.50
1850	17	20	1,212			
1851	17	32	1,230			
1852	16	51	1,175			
1853	18	37	1,133			
1854	18	15	1,365			
1855	19	25	1,408			
1856	19	15	1,472			
1857	19	12	1,545			
1858	20	29	1,782			
1859	20	29	1,951			
1860	20	38	2,087			
Totals		303	16,660	27.4	1,515	1.80

---

[163] Briar Creek Association, Minutes, *passim*.

Catawba River Association[164]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1831	19	10	819			
1838	20	7	732			
1839	21	6	760			
Totals		23	2,311	7.7	730	1.55
1840	24	6	668			
1841	23	13	766			
1843	15	10	315			
1844	16	6	315			
1846	16	8	331			
1847	16	1	280			
1848	14	8	267			
1849	15	7	331			
Totals		59	3,273	7.4	409	1.80
1850	14	4	239			
1851	14	6	438			
1855	14	13	472			
1856	12	20	352			
1857	11	9	384			
1858	14	8	429			
1859	14	4	517			
1860	11	4	410			
Totals		97	3,706	10.7	412	2.69

---

[164] North Carolina Baptist Association, Catawba River Association, Minutes, 1827-1959, passim. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Chowan Association[165]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1806	18	9	1,839			
1807	19	19	1,939			
1808	20	36	1,768			
1809	21	29	1,780			
Totals		92	7,334	23.0	1,834	1.25
1810	22	20	1,756			
1811	23	38	1,789			
1812	23	29	1,253			
1813	23	20	1,843			
1814	23	23	1,829			
1815	23	16	1,916			
1816	23	23	1,826			
1817	23	10	2,013			
1818	22	39	1,756			
1819	22	32	1,755			
Totals		250	17,736	25.0	1,774	1.41
			1,824			
1820	23	30	1,824			
1821	23	26	1,745			
1822	23	13	1,756			
1823	23	39	1,952			
1824	23	27	2,236			
1825	25	29	3,134			
1826	26	59	3,023			
1827	26	57	3,029			
1828	26	75	3,100			
1829	26	55	3,381			
Totals		410	25,180	41.0	2,518	1.63
1830	30	67	3,160			
1831	31	69	2,939			
1832	31	56	3,285			
1833	31	70	3,763			
1834	31	58	3,602			
1835	31	40	3,616			
1836	32	48	3,529			
1837	33	45	3,678			
1838	35	50	3,819			
1839	38	51	4,164			
Totals		554	35,555	55.4	3,556	1.56

Chowan Association (Continued)

1840	40	50	4,368			
1841	38	54	4,612			
1842	41	68	5.131			
1843	41	87	6,173			
1845	41	91	6,433			
1846	42	77	6,470			
1847	43	54	6,430			
1848	43	63	7,755			
1849	45	130	7,901			
Totals		**674**	**55,263**	**71.6**	**6,177**	**1.17**
1850	45	76	7,981			
1851	46	128	7,870			
1852	43	129	9,960			
1853	43	107	9,021			
1854	44	121	9,957			
1855	47	108	10,057			
1856	46	163	10.013			
1857	51	142	10,110			
1858	52	111	11,077			
1859	52	124	11,136			
1860	52	163	11,187			
Totals		**1,383**	**108.369**	**125.7**	**0,852**	**1.27**

Flat River Association[166]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1811	11	8	951			
1812	11	15	978			
Totals		23	1,929	11.5	965	1.19
1830	16	19	1,532			
1831	16	17	1,622			
1832	17	22	1,837			
1836	18	23	1,568			
1838	17	13	1,301			
1839	17	8	1,576			
Totals		102	9,435	17.0	1,573	1.70
1840	15	7	1,380			
1841	17	16	1,709			
1842	17	14	1,997			
1843	17	24	2,118			
1845	17	20	2,296			
1846	18	21	2,203			
1847	18	31	2,350			
1848	18	19	2,341			
1849	19	20	2,558			
Totals		172	18,954	16.9	2,106	0.81
1850	20	10	2,404			
1851	20	23	2,517			
1852	20	21	2,618			
1853	19	15	2,395			
1854	20	18	2,380			
1855	22	18	2,652			
1856	22	23	2,656			
1857	21	20	2,759			
1858	22	27	2,625			
1859	23	27	2,957			
1860	24	23	2,847			
Totals		225	28,810	20.1	2,610	0.77

---

[166] Flat River Association, Minutes, passim.

French Broad Association[167]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1815	15	15	586			2.56
1823	25	17	744			
1827	23	19	997			
Totals		36	1,741	18.5	872	2.14
1830	17	13	568			
1831	16	10	558			
Totals		23	1,126	11.5	563	2.05
1841	12	13	507			
1842	12	25	472			
1843	13	15	455			
1844	15	7	779			
1845	17	20	989			
1846	18	20	1,104			
1847	18	27	1,003			
1849	18	40	1,176			
Totals		167	6,485	21.0	811	2.59
1850	16	13	849			
1851	17	21	1,047			
1852	20	15	1,164			
1853	20	19	1,468			
1854	24	32	1,489			
1856	20	39	1,507			
1860	20	39	1,593			
Totals		174	9,117	24.9	1,302	1.91

---

[167] French Broad Association, Minutes, passim.

Liberty Association[168]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1832	7	0	188			
1833	9	3	270			
1834	9	4	570			
1835	9	10	661			
1836	9	3	649			
1837	10	11	660			
1838	10	14	665			
1839	10	15	532			
Totals		60	4,195	7.5	524	1.43
1840	11	11	651			
1841	12	3	682			
1842	12	6	555			
1843	12	4	552			
1844	12	2	560			
1845	12	4	589			
1846	12	6	574			
1847	12	3	543			
1848	12	2	646			
1849	11	4	604			
Totals		45	5,966	4.5	597	0.76
1850	13	6	814			
1851	13	26	827			
1852	13	5	809			
1853	13	11	837			
1854	13	9	841			
1855	13	8	847			
1856	14	4	980			
1857	14	13	855			
1858	14	7	840			
1859	14	7	898			
1860	14	9	918			
Totals		115	9,466	10.5	861	1.23

---

[168] North Carolina Baptist Associations, Liberty Association, *Minutes*, *1832-1924*, *passim*. Microfilm, Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Raleigh Association[169]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1826	27	31	1,323			2.35
1830	16	20	761			
1832	16	26	1,363			
1836	20	33	1,390			
1839	21	16	1,526			
Totals		95	5,040	23.8	1260	1.89
			1,693			
1840	23	27	1,693			
1841	23	36	1,950			
1842	25	22	2,291			
1844	26	35	2,911			
1846	28	25	2,926			
1847	29	62	2,903			
1848	29	33	3,020			
1849	28	39	3,138			
Totals		279	20,832	34.9	2,604	1.34
		48				
1850	29	48	3,473			
1851	31	37	3,722			
1852	32	35	3,822			
1853	33	34	3,989			
1854	33	57	4,126			
1855	33	49	4,100			
1856	33	44	4,711			
1857	34	46	4,692			
1858	35	68	4,799			
1859	34	85	4,758			
1860	35	58	4.633			
Totals		561	43,825	51.0	3,983	1.28

---

[169] North Carolina Baptist Associations, Raleigh Association, Minutes, 1826-1959, passim. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Sandy Creek Association[170]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1830	17	18	850			
1831	17	11	826			
1832	18	6	1,113			
1834	22	22	1,342			
1835	23	25	1,227			
1837	22	21	1,123			
1838	22	11	1,098			
1839	22	11	1,098			
Totals		125	8,677	15.6	1,085	1.47
1840	22	13	1,382			
1841	20	10	1,383			
1842	22	25	1,464			
1844	23	15	1,668			
1845	23	19	1,760			
1846	23	15	1,606			
1847	23	23	1,576			
1848	23	20	1,518			
1849	24	21	1,707			
Totals		171	14,064	16.8	1,563	1.07
1850	25	25	1,713			
1851	27	20	1,819			
1852	27	10	1,384			
1853	28	7	1,886=			
1854	29	17	2,030			
1855	29	16	2,426			
1856	31	30	2,539			
1857	32	35	2,669			
1858	33	57	2,706			
1859	33	26	2,705			
1860	33	23	2,408			
Totals		267	23,285	24.3	2,117	1.15

---

[170] North Carolina Baptist Associations, Sandy Creek Association, Minutes, 1815-1914, passim. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, NC.

Tar River Association[171]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1841	16	14	1,413			
1842	16	16	1,338			
1843	15	25	1,559			
1844	16	13	1,374			
1845	18	25	2,302			
1846	18	17	1,982			
1848	19	21	1,847			
1849	19	23	1,845			
Totals		154	13,660	17.1	1,518	1.13
1852	21	15	1,820			
1855	19	15	2,228			
1856	20	23	2,296			
1857	20	7	2,401			
1858	23	30	2,482			
1860	27	22	2,458			
Totals		112	13,685	18.7	2,281	2.39

---

[171] North Carolina Baptist Association, Tar River Association, Minutes, 1841-1925, passim. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Three Forks Association[172]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1842	13	12	599			
1843	14	10	677			
1844	13	17	646			
1845	13	12	642			
1846	13	16	639			
1847	13	28	607			
1848	13	12	821			
1849	13	27	822			
Totals		134	5,413	16.8	679	2.47
1850	15	23	817			
1851	17	23	898			
1852	18	47	868			
1853	18	13	1,005			
1854	15	31	805			
1855	18	16	810			
1856	18	17	806			
1857	17	20	753			
1858	18	10	908			
1859	19	19	941			
1860	19	11	1,000			
Totals		230	9,601	20.9	873	2.39

---

[173] North Carolina Baptist Associations, Three Forks Association, *Minutes*, *1841-1959*, *passim*. Microfilm, Historical Commission, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Copy at Wake Forest College Library, Winston-Salem N.C.

Tuckasiege Association[173]

Year	No. of Churches	Number Excluded	Membership	Ave. No. of Exclusions	Ave. Membership	Rate
1831	10	12	276			4.32
1840	19	15	558			
1843	20	12	441			
1845	19	5	607			
1846	19	15	867			
1847	21	23	960			
1848	23	11	985			
Totals		71	4,418	11.8	736	1.60
1851	35	20	921			
1857	27	27	899			
1858	28	24	1,215			
1859	29	47	1,317			
1860	31	36	1,148			
Totals		154	5,500	30.8	1,100	2.16

---

[173] Tuckasiege Association, Minutes, passim.

Recapitulation of Annual Expulsion Rates by Decades.

Association	1800-1809	1810-1819	1820-1829	1830-1839	1840-1849	1850-1860
Beulah				1.62	1.21	1.31
Brier Creek			1.53	1.33	1.50	1.80
Catawba River				1.55	1.80	2.69
Chowan	1.25	1.41	1.63	1.56	1.17	1.27
Flat River		1.19		1.70	0.81	0.77
French Broad		2.56	2.14	2.05	2.59	1.91
Liberty				1.43	0.76	1.23
Raleigh			2.35	1.89	1.34	1.28
Sandy Creek				1.47	1.07	1.15
Tar River					1.13	0.82
Three Forks					2.47	2.39
Tuckasiege				4.32	1.60	2.16